

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET
FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

JULY, 1908.

The Problem of the Genesis of Life in Nature.	J. B. KEENE	321
Prophecies Concerning the New Church.	JAMES REED	340
The Church and the Social Question.	JOHN GODDARD	350
The Vital Importance of Memorizing the Word.	GEORGE S. WHEELER	364
Backsliders.	WARREN GODDARD	370
Teaching Youth at the Critical Age in the Sunday-School.	WALTER A. ROBINSON	379
The Poetry of Courtship and Marriage.	ARTHUR MERCER	392
Mental Healing: Its Practical Side.	HENRY E. GODDARD	405
Samuel Mills Warren.	JAMES REED	422
The Semi-Insane and Swedenborg. [A Review of "The Semi-Insane and Semi-Responsible," by Joseph Grasset.]	H. CLINTON HAY	427

Editorial Department: 431

The Recognition of Swedenborg's Greatness; Immortality and Natural Science; A Factor often Overlooked in our Study of Social Conditions; The Distinctiveness of the New-Church Idea of God.

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies: 446

Was Swedenborg a Free-Mason? Noxious Animals Apparently Antecedent to Man; Swedenborg's Terms Relating to Marriage.

Current Literature: 463

Swedenborg's Divine Love and Wisdom, and Divine Providence, Library Edition; Manual for New-Church Sunday-School Teachers, 1907-1908; Fischer and Hoeck's Commentary on the Gospel According to John; Barler's An Essay on the Memorable Relations; Worland's Love, Sacred and Profane; Sabatier's An Open Letter to His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons; Freeth's The True Theology; Sanday's The Life of Christ in Recent Research.

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION,

16 ARLINGTON STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY.

(ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas.)

\$2.00 A YEAR

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

Fourteen years ago the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW was established as the successor of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, in the belief that the change of form, allowing as it does for longer articles and for a greater variety of contents, would be of advantage in attempting to cover the field which the earlier publication had so long occupied. That field, as is well known, is the one brought to view in the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, which, being founded on the Holy Scriptures, contain, as we believe, the vital principles of a new dispensation of Christian faith and life, and promise, so far as they shall be received by men, to accomplish the fulfilment of prophecy in establishing the Lord's kingdom on earth.

The REVIEW has sought to give expression to these principles, and to bring their light to bear upon all subjects and events which may be affected by them, whether in the organized Church of the New Jerusalem, in the religious bodies around us, or in the world at large.

The Board of Editors now consists of the Rev. William H. Mayhew, as managing editor, and of the Rev. Messrs. H. Clinton Hay and Lewis F. Hite; with the Rev. James Reed in an advisory capacity. The efforts of the editors have been cordially and generously seconded by other writers in this country and abroad, and the result has been such as to call out many expressions of approval both within and without the special lines of the REVIEW's activity.

A literary critic says: "This publication does the New-Church clergy and laity great credit;" another says: "The NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is a quarterly journal which should prove vastly interesting and instructive to any reader, whatever his or her faith;" another speaks of the "candor and ability" of our articles; and a fourth declares that "it is filled with the sweet liberality of this generous faith."

In entering upon its fifteenth year the REVIEW asks for the continued and increased support of those whose cause it serves, in order that it may be yet more useful in the future.

\$2.00 A YEAR.

SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union, 16 Arlington Street, Boston.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XV.]

JULY, 1908.

[No. 3.]

THE PROBLEM OF THE GENESIS OF LIFE IN NATURE.

WHEN men of science speak of life, what it is; where it comes from; how it begins; why it ends; and then what becomes of it; they refer only to natural life, the life of animals and vegetables; and many of them think that the life of man is of the same kind and ends like theirs at death. Those who are religious, and believe in a life after death, rarely think of any difference in kind between natural life and spiritual life and have an idea that for it to be consciously continued it will require to have the old body in some way again; for the spirit is looked on in its disembodied state as a kind of vapor or breath to which no human qualities belong while it remains separate. But some of the more simple-minded have an indistinct perception not only that life is continued after death, but that it is conscious life, with no break in its continuance, though they are content to be ignorant of the manner of its existence. The charlatans of spiritism play upon this general ignorance, and indeed increase it; for what they pretend to show of the life beyond, makes it appear anything but desirable, and leaves the impression that spirits are leading a very stupid kind of existence and are fond of deceiving us and playing certain very clumsy conjuring tricks upon us. Of anything of a heavenly, intellectual character there is not the least sign; and those who

trust in their manifestations find them unreliable and useless. Curiously enough there are scientists who seek to find something in these seances that can be dealt with under the cold treatment of scientific methods; but this appears to be only a mode of indulging their own credulity under another name, for they do not set to work on the right lines.

As life is seen in the natural world it is various in aspect and quality, but in all its conditions is only natural; and, if spiritism is to be credited, life after death though unnatural is most certainly very far from supernatural. But leaving these issues to which we have referred, we will, in the first place, confine ourself to the main object of our paper, namely the question of what Huxley called biogenesis, and Bastian archebiosis; that is the mode in which natural life commenced on the earth, and of its continuance; and also as to whether it can be reproduced at this day without the preëxistence of a germ; and finally treat of the special life of man as distinguished from brutes, and of its continuance to eternity after natural death.

Philosophers in all ages, that is of periods known as historical, have discussed the question of how living things came first into existence; that is, did the germ precede the thing, or the thing the germ? At the present day they take alternate precedence, so the question remains still open. The theory that the germ came first is most widely held. It is maintained that where there is no germ life ends; for the germ cannot be reproduced now, and without it the living thing cannot exist. But there are some who think the germ can come afresh into existence, or even that a living thing can be directly produced, without a germ, and have the capacity of proliferation. Indeed, certain experimenters affirm that they have been able to educe forms of life in conditions in which no germ previously existed, but from which germs can be produced to continue their existence.

As an explanation of the course of creation the theory of evolution depends on the germ theory for its very existence. It not only insists that no living thing can now come into being without a progenitor, but also that one original primordial

germ, or nucleated cell of protoplasm, was the parent of creation; all subsequent varieties having been evolved from it, and it only. Whether the evolution took its course, as well as its origin by chance and accident, or whether under certain conditions annexed to the first monad, there was a kind of prearranged direction, are views held according to the respective opinions of the holders in regard to God; but the idea of evolution has for the present taken hold of nearly every one as a sort of religious belief or scientific fetish. This position it holds because it is based on natural appearances much misread, as was the Pythagorean system of astronomy of former times. The appearances will still continue, as in that case, when read aright, but they will then confirm the true theory, without any of the difficulties at present encountered in the endeavor to bolster up existing systems; for it is the same as ever in science. Theories are first formed from mere appearances, but later on from a perception of their causes. In the present general view of the matter the circumference is made to precede and produce the centre; the primordial germ being the very exterior and lowest possible form of life, while man, though last in time, is in reality the true centre of natural life, being the very object for which the universe was created; the lowest forms being, necessarily, first caused to exist, as man's existence would else have been impossible, though potentially the first.

The difficulty, from natural science, to explain the initiament of life in a world of dead matter, induced the idea of the nucleated cell, or monad, or protoplasm as the starting point of creation, produced in some unknown manner from the heat, moisture, and slime of early geological conditions. The difference between this and the dead substances in which it originated, that is, its life and powers of growth and reproduction were left unaccounted for, or not troubled about. The amount of it was so small, the thing itself so minute, that it was scarcely worth notice. Huxley said that it was merely a quality of protoplasm, and saw no difference between dead or living protoplasm; for the dead protoplasm called mutton, when eaten became

living in the eater. And yet from it, according to the theory, was evolved all the higher life of the vegetable and animal kingdom; for it would have been a fresh perplexity to assume a new starting point, a special germ for every further development of living things. Hence came the evolutionary theory which is now esteemed the science of sciences, being applied to every conceivable subject that may be under consideration, material, mental, or moral.

But no theory that attempts to evade the acknowledgment of a Divine Creator will ever solve the question. Creation can only be the work of One who knew what He desired to do, and how to do it in the best and only way. We know by experience that every plant or animal reproduces its like continually, but because some hybrids thrive it is assumed that by similar means different species have been produced, though no absolute example has ever been proved to exist. The "descent" of man from the ape is now accepted by many as if it were a Bible truth, though the vast chasm between them has never been bridged by a fact of any kind; so that the "missing link" has now dwindled to a mere scientific or clerical joke. Yet there seems almost a desire with some to "claim kindred there and have their claim allowed"; for, so earnest are they to prove their genealogical descent from so distinguished an ancestry, that they try to fill the interval by a "link" of which the existence is only proved by the want of it. A scientific form of the old confession of faith; "*Credo quia impossibile.*"

At the present day the most universal, if not the only way in which life is continued on the earth is by procreation or propagation; but the question is, how did it commence? Was the germ, or the thing, the antecedent? To which is to be added, Can the original conditions recur, so that the individual, or its germ, can come into existence for a first time, without a predecessor? Can there be inception without conception, generation without procreation? Or to put it more concisely, Is it possible for God to create anew? or, Is the first creation final and incapable of repetition, even in part?

We shall take for granted the existence of a Divine Creator who is a being of infinite love, wisdom, and power, and consequently life itself. That from His love and in and by His wisdom He creates all things as recipients of life from Himself, each in its own degree of capacity of reception, and for its own special use in relation to the rest. We shall not attempt to prove this postulate for the following reasons. First, because there is no common ground of argument with an atheist who sees nothing beyond nature, and knows nothing of how things came into existence beyond guesses and surmises; second, it is not necessary with those who are in simple ignorance of God, but not in a state of denial; or who believe in a God, but know nothing clearly about Him. Nevertheless in what we have further to say it is possible that even the first may admit that there is as good a *primâ facie* case for our view as for his own; while those in the second category may think we have the best of the argument altogether, and gladly own it.

There is not nearly as much difficulty in assuming as Creator an uncreate infinite being, who was life itself, and from whom all things came into existence in accordance with infinite order; as there is in assuming the origin of all things in something unknown and without quality called matter, which causelessly produced a vast series of material substances full of qualities and uses; and, ultimately, a jelly-like substance called a monad, from which, without design or intention, all living things were evolved in an orderly series, wonderful in beauty and variety, and requiring all man's powers to investigate, classify, and utilize. Some holders of this idea have been driven to deify something they call vaguely "force" to overcome the inertia of matter, but which is equally blind and unintelligent with the matter on which it acts. This is evidence that they feel the necessity of action and reaction in the creation and maintenance of the universe. Hence, force and matter, activity and inertia. The great thing all these theorists seek to evade is the idea that man's intellectual powers are not his own, self-derived and self-existent; and though they see no

reason to doubt mental as well as material evolution from protoplasm, it does not affect their belief in their own godlike capacity.

Let us essay a different theory of creation in which we reverse this course of things, starting from infinite power and perfection capable of producing all things in a perfect series in which cause is always prior and superior to effect, from the highest to the lowest in the scale of creation.

God is life itself; He is therefore the source and origin of life in every form.

As God is life He is uncreate; for life cannot be created, but it can create.

If life came forth from another there would be another who was life, and this life would be life in itself.

If the first were not life in itself, it would either be from another, or from itself; and life from itself cannot be assumed, because from itself involves an origin.

This, therefore, is the life itself which is God, and which is a Man: the only MAN, from whom are derived all things that make man His image and likeness when in the order of his creation.

God is perfect man; the difference is in essence, not in form. Which is, that He is love itself, wisdom itself, and thus life itself.

Life in itself, which is God, cannot create another who is life alone, for being uncreate, it is not separable. Hence God is one.

But life in itself can, from substances, create forms which are not lives; but it can be in them, and can give them, as it were, to live. These forms are men, who, being receptacles of life, could not at first creation be anything but images and likenesses of God, for life and its recipients adapt themselves as active and passive, but do not commingle.

Thus human forms, being recipients of life, do not live from themselves, but from God, who alone is life.

Starting from these principles, which may at least be accepted

as logical, as well also as rational, let us see how they will work out in explaining natural life on earth. Nature and life are quite distinct. Nature begins with the natural sun, but life is from the heavenly sun, which is the first emanation from God, from which proceeds pure love, which is life. The natural sun provides the natural substances from which life creates the forms which are recipient of life; for this sun has no life whatever of its own; all life being from the spiritual sun. All living things, therefore, exist from God, and subsist from Him also; for subsistence is perpetual existence. But there is no perpetuity of existence in their natural forms, for motion and change are the only way in which matter, in material substances, reacts on the influx of life, which is, indeed, the cause of their reaction; otherwise, in themselves, they are inert and dead, and only simulate life so that they appear as if it were their own.

For life to begin there must be preparatory conditions favorable to the reception of the influx, which is ever ready to act. Thus the seed of a plant must be so prepared, or it will not grow. All seeds do not grow even then, and the difference between a living seed and a dead one is not always apparent. The best proof that there is a capability of reciprocating the action of life is that it does grow. The seed itself was prepared by the life which acted on the plant in which it was formed. But seed, whether vegetable or animal, requires a womb in which it can put on the substances needed for its growth into a replica of the original form in which it was produced. This in the case of animals is in the female; in the case of plants it is in the common mother—earth.

One of the strongest proofs of the Divine origin of life is to be found in what appears to be the infinitudinous excess of the production of seed; for, if there were no means provided to restrict the exuberance possible were every seed to mature its kind, there would soon be an end to all things. We have thus the semblance of infinity for ever around us. "All nature quick and bursting into birth."

But to continue life there must be in the living thing continued fitness for subsistence; that is, the recipient forms must be capable of reacting to the living influx. When this ceases we have the death of the individual, or the species; but there is no cessation of the flux of life ever ready to enter into substances prepared for reaction and thus to produce a continuance of living things.

Before answering the questions already propounded as to the commencement of natural life on earth, the mode of its continuance, and whether any of the former conditions recur, let us take a rapid general glance at the position of the scientific world on the subject, when we shall see that opinions still vary, and are uncertain.

It will not be necessary to go very far back in the matter, for though scientists have for ages theorized and experimented about it, their investigations were often vitiated by the omission of some necessary precaution; and opinions are so strongly held that they are only given up on irresistible evidences. Coming then to about the third decade of the last century the production of the *Acarus Crossii* by Mr. Crosse, of Taunton, England, was the ground of intense disputes which discouraged him from continuing his experiments. They were, however, pursued later on by Mr. Weekes, of Sandwich, with confirmatory results, but occupying a much longer period as he worked with less battery power.

The author of "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation"—a work that raised a great conflict of opinion, and paved the way for Darwin—favored the views of Crosse and Weekes, and briefly described their modes of experiment which he considered had not been fairly and candidly treated. In Mr. Crosse's case he was not looking out for any biogenesis, as he was pursuing experiments in crystallization, on a saturated solution of potassium silicate under the influence of a powerful galvanic battery, when the insects unexpectedly showed themselves under most unlikely circumstances. He repeated the experiment with nitrate of copper, taking great precautions, and again

obtained live insects; but did not continue his experiments, being discouraged by the way in which they were received. Mr. Weekes some years later repeated these experiments very carefully, the insects produced being of the same kind as in the case of Mr. Crosse; and soon after coming into existence they began to propagate and sometimes to eat each other.

The religious authorities of the time combined with the scientists to reject an idea that consorted with the views of neither, from different grounds, but with about equal reason. The former argued as if the experimenters had claimed creative powers, which they had not done; the latter saw their pet theories upset, and denied with ridicule the whole facts, as founded on faulty details in the operations. The question was then deemed no longer in dispute, and slumbered more or less until in 1872 Dr. H. C. Bastian published a book on the "Beginnings of Life," in which he contested the conclusions that had been thought fully established by Pasteur; namely, that living things can only be derived from preëxisting living things. Pasteur, Tyndall, Huxley, and others vehemently attacked the daring exponent of "spontaneous generation," as it was then most inappropriately termed, implying, as it does, volition on the part of a non-existent being. This contest lasted some five years. Dr. Bastian was assumed to be *hors de combat*, and the heretics were silenced. But more than thirty years later, when professorial preoccupation permitted, Dr. Bastian resumed his researches with unshaken confidence, and has recently published a book on "The Evolution of Life," reaffirming his views, with further corroboration by experiment. A French scientist, Professor Le Dantec, has also recently issued a work on the "Nature and Origin of Life in the Light of New Knowledge," in which he invalidates Pasteur's experiments as not being final. There is no need here to compare the arguments on both sides, our point being that the dispute is not yet settled. But in the course of years the most active opponents of Dr. Bastian have passed away, and the discovery of radium and its connections has opened a new scientific outlook which revo-

lutionizes many preconceived ideas and theories. We may therefore expect less scientific antagonism to Dr. Bastian's idea of what he terms archebiosis; and that any differences of view will be expressed with less of what we may call scientific billingsgate than before.

We will now take up the questions we have propounded as arising from the subject. In the first place it is certain that natural life must have had a beginning in some form or other; if not it must be uncreate; that is, infinite and eternal. But natural life, as we know it, both begins and ends, being in a state of incessant fluctuation and change, depending on the condition of the organized natural forms as to their state of receptivity of the living influx from God, who not only creates by life from Himself the natural forms, but sustains them continually, which is, *virtually*, perpetual creation. If this influx of life could cease for an instant, the entire universe would perish; for not only do animal and vegetable life depend upon it for their maintenance, but minerals also, which derive from it all the qualities and uses which differentiate them from each other. So also the solar vortices which govern the planetary motions; for life in all natural substances is seen not only in their motions as a whole, but in their molecules and atoms, a glimpse of which has already been perceived in the study of radium.

In creation on the natural plane the natural sun is the sub-agent of the spiritual sun. Of itself it has no life; but it was the first or central point created by God to receive the spiritual forces and envelop them with natural forces, and supply the material substances in which they are ultimated in creation. By means of this sun the influx of life creates forms suitable for its reception in the various existences in the world. Without such recipient forms life could not operate, but the life they receive and manifest is of the degree for which they are formed, and in that degree only appears to belong to them as if their own. Therefore the more highly organized the forms themselves are, the more self-living they appear to be; so that in the

case of man, who is the only being conscious of his life and capable of thinking about it, he is apt to consider it absolutely his own. In this case he fails to recognize that his life is supplied him continually by his Creator, not merely as to his body, the life of which he shares with the brute, but as to his spiritual form, in which he excels them. This sense of self-existence is his alone of all created beings, and well is it for him if he refers it to its proper source in God.

Life in God is uncreate and indivisible, being infinite. It cannot therefore be transferred, but it can create the recipient forms into which it can flow in the ratio of receptivity. Creation could not have begun otherwise than from the lowest forms of life, progressing upwards towards the highest; for the first forms, to have existed in the early conditions of the earth, must have been very low indeed. As these conditions became modified higher forms were possible, which, as they came into being, assisted the changes that were proceeding around them. Thus, step by step through the ages creation proceeded in a geometrical ratio of ascending series. It was mis-called evolution, on the principle of *post hoc, propter hoc*, as if the lowest forms evolved the higher forms, and gave them qualities they did not themselves possess, and therefore could not supply; and thus, even allowing the existence of God as the source of creation limited his action to the original monad which managed to complete the task from the impetus received at first starting.

Now it cannot be denied that the creator of the first germ, or monad, could also create the next higher and so on; for to assume the first to possess inherent creative powers, with no intelligence to direct their use, would imply a creative blunder. But it is not necessary to suppose that the first and lowest form of life was limited to the first existence, any more than that it was the *fons omnium viventium*. Divine order begins necessarily with the lowest forms as the foundation for the higher; not discarding the first, or, as it were, "kicking the ladder away" as it proceeded, but using it throughout for its intended purpose. That this is the case is proved by the acknowledged fact that

even in the human ovum there is evidence of the existence of the lowest forms in the earliest stages of the foetus. This is taken by many as an argument for the atheistic theory of evolution; but it is far more certainly a proof of the Creator's loving and wise guidance through every grade of existence. It is also confirmatory of the fact known from the most ancient times that man is a microcosm, and includes, in his organization of body and spirit, representatives of all things in the universe; and therefore is more truly the image and likeness of his Creator of whose divine love and wisdom the universe is the outbirth. Indeed, it is an evident fact that man, as a spiritual being, intended for eternal existence as the climax of creation, was in view from the beginning; hence every created thing anticipates and emulates the human form, as may be proved by the study of comparative anatomy. The approximation to this form in the ape has led to the supposition of certain intervening forms or links, having dropped out of existence. But the ape is an almost diabolical caricature of humanity, and evinces the vast chasm that lies between the brute mind and that of man, which no continuity could ever unite; for the degree is absolutely discrete, being superior and interior.

From what has been said it will be seen that we do not believe that any living thing was created in its complete and perfect form at first, but that it passed previously through the stage of germ, and developed afterwards. It follows, therefore, that in all subsequent instances a germ must, in some way, come into being. Hence every living thing is provided with the capacity of producing like germs *ad infinitum*, for the procreation of its kind. This form of reproductive force has been so constantly observed that it has been assumed to be the only possible way in which existence can be continued; and the idea of any recurrence to the formation of a germ *de novo* is entirely repudiated by the scientist. Various plants and animals are known to have become extinct, and no evidence having been found of their reproduction, it is decided that they are extinct forever.

We cannot, however, prescribe limits to the Creator's power

to create a new germ if there be need for it, which would be shown by the suitability of the natural conditions at the time. In whatever way existence may be continued, whether by a new germ, or from a preëxisting one, the same divine power is involved, for there is no difference in that respect in either case, subsistence being perpetual existence. The question may arise as to whether a special living thing was derived from a newly created germ, or from a prior one; and the probability would be equally against either if the circumstances of the experiment were germicidal, as the thing itself could scarcely live where its germ would be destroyed. Naturalists have at times been puzzled by the sudden appearance of certain insects and plants, in circumstances where none of the kind were previously known. In most cases a use for their existence has been observed, which, having ceased, they have disappeared and left no trace behind, as if they had never been. This, and the persistence of belief in a Creator constantly creating, has induced some men of science to recognize the possibility of a recurrence of life after the manner of its first production, or even of the existence of new forms of living things; but the majority of scientists have opposed the idea strongly. We can have but little doubt that these recurrences are mostly confined to the lower forms of life if they exist at all; for the higher forms of plants or animals are much less likely to die out, except in the case of useless and destructive kinds, which tend to disappear before the advance of civilization. But the reproduction of useful kinds is stimulated by human care far beyond what it would be in wild conditions, and will doubtless continue so long as they are required for the service of man. As for man himself there is no fear of his dying out, seeing he is the crown of creation; but though it is certain there will be no need in his case of a new creation, yet he is still in course of creation continually, as, indeed, all things else are; for procreation and sustentation are nothing less.

The experiments that have apparently led to the origination of living things by Crosse, Weekes, Bastian, and others took

place under conditions not favorable to the existence of prior germs, and equally inimical to living things; yet all assert that in such conditions life became embodied in receptive forms as new existences. For instance, potassium silicate or copper nitrate are not apparently the most suitable birthplaces, even for acari; yet in their experiments Mr. Crosse and Mr. Weekes used such menstrua. In both electricity was an agent, and may have had an important effect on the results not yet understood. Dr. Bastian has, however, again returned to the charge, and time will show how far his experiments have confirmed his theory. We do not see any necessity on our part to insist upon them. We depend upon the fact that if, in the first instance, certain conditions favored the generation of living things, the recurrence of such conditions would inevitably lead to the same result. We may also admit that in the experiments of Bastian and others, new recipients of life may have come into being, even under such adverse conditions as they apparently were.

These conclusions do not in any way oppose the grand fact that in all created things an infinitude of procreation is provided for. Still there are conditions as necessary to the continuance of life as to its commencement, where such conditions change or fail the form itself ceases, and we may then only have geological evidence of its ever having existed. Such evidence of preëxisting but now extinct animals, as we find, is deeply interesting as a study; but it is impossible to link them in a sequence, without so many missing links as to play havoc with the evolutionary theories without an immense amount of make-believe to fill the gaps, especially if they eliminate God from His creation. Primordial conditions must have been such as required the forms of life of which we get such uncertain and erratic glimpses hidden away in the earth's crust; and the influx of life into the substances in such peculiar conditions inevitably produced them. As such conditions evidently cannot recur, the living creatures themselves are permanently extinct. It is nevertheless quite possible in the present state of the earth that there may be local changes unfavorable to certain

forms of life which may, therefore, cease for a time, but be renewed when the previous state recurs; and this may equally be by a biogenesis, or from germs left at the former period.

We have already referred to that theory of evolution which assumes that the lowest germs of life developed into higher forms, which again, successively, made further progressive betterment through apes to men, but denies the possibility of a separate genesis for genera, species, or varieties. But because every germ in the rising scale includes, or appears to do so, the lowest grades in its first state, it is no proof whatever that it therefore was evolved from it. No microscope will ever reach the inner mystery of even the lowest germ, much less that of the higher ones. Yet there is neither impossibility nor improbability in the germ being, from the first, formed for its special receptivity of life when it shall be fully developed into its proper form. In such case its course of formation in the foetus would necessarily partake of all degrees between and inclusive of its first and last condition.

No conception of God as the Creator can be more opposed to the reality than the idea of exertion, or cessation of influence. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. All change is limited entirely to nature. The natural sun by which He works represents Him in the unceasing constancy of its action, which is solely maintained by His infinite love, which is the life of all things. We must therefore admit that the influx of life into natural forms is eternally constant. There can be no intermittent action, no imbecility of design; anything to the contrary appearing is solely due to the needs of the occasion, and variations of receptivity and of reaction.

We therefore unhesitatingly affirm that each species or variety was a part of His eternal design to be developed as necessary in proper time and place. The Creator, infinite and eternal, is in all time without time, and in all space without space; for both time and space are solely consequent on the existence of nature on the fixed basis of matter, which, by the influx of life stimulating its reaction, can be formed into suitable recipient organisms for the purposes intended.

But the influx of life is not confined to the natural plane alone in the formation of living things produced by means of the natural sun and its atmospheres, and receiving, in their highest grades of animal life, only those instincts needed for temporary natural existence. Such a termination would be to leave the universe unfinished—"Oh most lame and impotent conclusion"—with a vast gap between it and the Creator, totally unfilled. Yet modern science, while it revels in gaps or missing links, sees none between nature and God, but is content to assume that all such below man have, at one time or other, been filled, to satisfy their theories; but, that by a kind of desuetude, they have now dropped out of the reckoning. This course of theorizing is consistent enough in regard to evolution upside down, or the indeterminate formation of things, started without scheme and continued without design, but which, by accidents and contingencies, has produced a wonderfully orderly series, requiring intense and constant study to discover even the least of its marvellous secrets.

The true, scientific mode of tracing its course is, as before said, only to be found in the acknowledgment of a Creator of infinite love and wisdom who is life itself; from whom all life begins; to whom it all tends; and whose image is seen in all His works. Viewed in this manner all order is seen to be divine, and no difficulties can arise from missing links. Thus creation can be traced from God to God again.

Mention has been made of the atmospheres from the sun by means of which nature came into being. These, having no life of themselves, received their necessary vitality from an interior series in a corresponding degree, emanating from the spiritual sun; and by the united action of these together natural things were created as to substance, form, and life. These acted in the three discrete natural degrees, mineral, vegetable, and animal, in which last degree both the former coexist. They also coexist in man to fit him for his life in the natural world, as the "paragon of animals," in regard to his sensuous and corporeal life. But man is not merely an animal whose life

is guided by a special instinct coincident with its form. He has no such guide. His mind is blank at birth, requiring aid and instruction at every step. But he is gifted with an unlimited capacity for the acquisition of knowledge and the power to look down upon his own sensual life; to examine his motives, regulating his thoughts and actions by interior principles, and acknowledging His Maker, and doing His will.

All these degrees of life are unprovided for by the three natural degrees which he shares with the brute; and they mark his intensely vital distinction from them. Man is a spiritual being, born for eternal existence in a higher state of life, and under more substantial conditions than are possible in a world bounded by space and time. But the very limitations which surround him here have been divinely arranged to serve the higher purpose; for it was a necessity that before he passed on to his eternal state he should go through a period of spiritual probation, during which he could, in perfect mental freedom, fit himself for the state which he preferred, because it suited his ruling love, the character of which would fix his state forever. The problem of eternal existence could be solved in no other way; for natural space could only contain room enough for a limited number of beings, while the spiritual world has no such limitations, and will find admittance for all the human race in the universe who may be born to all eternity.

In the germ of human life from the father provision is made by the Lord for the three degrees of spiritual life into which he can come hereafter; as well also for the lower degrees of natural life. The former make him a spiritual being, to live for ever; the latter fit him for his preparatory state of existence in this world. In the womb of the mother the natural substances are provided, which are gradually formed by the influx of life acting through the spiritual soul of the germ into a body to suit itself, thus ensuring the special identity of each individual human being; for the soul is the man, the body only its natural covering, having merely a derivative appearance of life while the union continues in this world. When that ceases, the body,

being no longer required, is separated forever; and this separation is what is known as death. The body then loses the semblance of life it previously possessed, and is resolved into its natural elements, while the man himself in his spiritual state of existence is only recognizable by the spiritual senses; but to them he is even more truly substantial than while here.

The life of man is so given him, even in this world, as to appear to be absolutely his own; and with it also he is endowed with the two great, human faculties of liberty and rationality, so that he may seem to himself to be self-existent; for he has no conscious sense of the divine influx by which all these human powers are maintained within him. But these appearances, like all others, must not be taken at their face value; and if his rational faculty is illuminated by spiritual light—which is truth—he will acknowledge this to be the case. In so doing he will see that it could not appear otherwise, or he would not be a man, such as God intended him to be; that is, one who could rationally and freely receive this wonderful gift of life, and use it to reciprocate the love that has made him what he is.

By the faculties of liberty and rationality man is enabled to enter into the three degrees of spiritual life, which, like the three lower degrees, are not continuous, but discrete, and are united by correspondence as cause, and effect. The lowest degree connects him with the things of nature by means of his five senses and refers entirely to sensuous impressions, and the activities and uses of his natural life thence derived, with its sciences and memories. These belong to the lower, or external, division of the duplex rational mind, which is the medium of connection between the things of this world and those of heaven. This, being the most actively used during life in the world, is thus rendered more energetic and influential; and, being still in the region of natural appearances deals mainly with them and devotes its powers to their confirmation.

The next above is the interior division of the rational mind, which, with such as are altogether immersed in the natural degree, is closed to the reception of any higher degree of life.

But if the man desires to elevate himself above the things of time and space, he can open it to the reception of the divine influx of life and light which is ever flowing into the inmost degree of his life. This human inmost is beyond his direct consciousness, but through it the Lord maintains him in life, rationality, and freedom, which are the birthright of every man, and if he thus does his part in reciprocating the divine love, the light from heaven enlightens his entire rational faculty, shines through the interior into the exterior, and throws a new light upon all his natural thoughts and perceptions, raising them from judgment according to appearances only, and enabling him to judge righteous judgment. The scientific powers he had previously attained now acquire new life and vigor; he becomes filled with the higher life which the world alone can never give; he will not, however, be taken out of the world, but will be kept from the evil. So far as this is done in his own liberty, as from himself, but in the sincere acknowledgment that all his powers are from God, he will become more distinctively human; and the very life which he knows to be ever flowing from its only source will still more strongly appear to be his own now, and to all eternity.

J. B. KEENE.

PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE NEW CHURCH.

No one probably will be disposed to deny that of late years a certain spirit of unrest has made itself felt in the church. That spirit, in the minds of many, has been connected with a sense of disappointment, because the growth of the church as an organized body has been so slow. All kinds of measures have been proposed, and not a few have been tried, in hopes of relieving the situation; but thus far without any marked success. These have so widely differed from each other that the success of them all would be indeed impossible because of the manifest contradictions which they involve. Perhaps the only thing on which there is entire agreement is that the church, so far as depends on the efforts of her members, will prosper just in proportion as they are devoted to her interests, each in his own way doing the best he can to learn, to impart, and to live her heavenly doctrines.

But, be this as it may, nothing can be more certain than that a restless and impatient spirit is itself one of the chief impediments to progress. Far be it from any of us to come into states of passivity or indifference. No good cause can ever be prosperous if its advocates cease to be active and zealous on its behalf. But it does not thence follow that they should be anxious. If the results which they hope for are not achieved all at once they have no right to be discouraged. The most that any one can do is to try. Your way or mine may not be the best way. You and I may be very unfit and incompetent instruments in carrying out desirable purposes. Or the world may not be ready for what we have to offer. Yet these are no reasons why we should be dispirited, or relax our efforts. What do we know about the plans and methods of Providence? What gift of prophecy have we that we may claim to read the future? Verily all is safe in the Lord's hands. And His invariable

teaching is, "Be not anxious." "Be not anxious for the morrow: for the morrow shall be anxious for itself." Our part is to do each day's work as well as we know how, leaving the results with Him. Then shall we be quiet and contented, whatever befalls. We shall not worry, if events do not turn out just according to our liking; nor shall we complain of others, if their opinions and actions honestly differ from our own. This steadfast, uncomplaining, reliance on the Lord is one of the beautiful garments which the church must always wear, if she is to prove herself truly "Jerusalem, the holy city." Any other state of mind is a disorderly and diseased one. Impatience is a kind of spiritual fever. Anxiety is spiritual paralysis.

In approaching our subject we may well ask ourselves at the outset whether there is any reason to expect that the growth of the external New Church will at first be rapid. On the contrary, are we not led to anticipate exactly the opposite? There can be no doubt on this point. The teachings of the church are quite explicit in relation to it. For example, we read as follows in the "Apocalypse Revealed":—

"The woman fled into the wilderness" signifies the church, which is the New Jerusalem, at first among a few. By the woman the New Church is signified, and by the wilderness is signified, where are no longer any truths. That the church is at first among a few, is meant, because this follows, "Where she hath a place prepared by God, that they may nourish her there a thousand two hundred and sixty days," by which is meant its state at that time, that meanwhile preparation may be made for it among many, until it grows to its appointed state (546).

Again we are assured that,—

It is of Divine Providence that the church should first be among a few, and should increase gradually among many, because the falsities of the former church must first be removed, as truths cannot before be received; for truths which are received and implanted before falsities are removed do not remain, and are also dissipated by the dragonists. The case was the same with the Christian Church, that it increased gradually from a few to many. Another reason is that a new heaven must first be formed, which will make one with the church on earth; on which account we read that he saw a new heaven, and the Holy Jerusalem coming down from

God out of heaven. It is certain that a new church, which is the New Jerusalem will exist, because it is foretold in the Apocalypse; and it is also certain that the falsities of the former church must first be removed; for these are treated of in the Apocalypse, as far as the twentieth chapter (547).

There is no ambiguity about these statements. They plainly declare that the New Church at its beginning will be small and feeble, and will grow but slowly. The reasons given for this state of things are not hard to understand. First, new truth cannot be received till prevailing falsities are removed from the minds of men; and this is a gradual process. Secondly, the increase of the church on earth must be commensurate with its growth in the other world, which growth is dependent on the same conditions, and is likewise necessarily gradual. If we consider these causes more closely the situation will become clearer.

Is it not indeed self-evident that two opposite kinds of belief and influence cannot be harbored in the mind at one and the same time? In the strong language of Swedenborg the faith of the old church and the faith of the new "can no more be together than an owl and a dove in one nest" (Brief Exposition, 103). There can be no union between religious professions whose fundamental principles are at variance with each other. The unqualified worship of the one God cannot be instilled till the idea of three Divine persons is cast out. No genuine life of charity will be found among men as long as they hold to the dogma of salvation by faith alone. And, though this dogma be outwardly discarded, the essence of it, which is the tendency, on man's part, to separate religion from daily living, may still survive, and not be easily eradicated. So is it with other doctrines which have prevailed in the church. Even after they have loosened their grasp their power continues to be felt.

As we contemplate the present state of the religious world, what kind of a picture is brought to view? A wonderful change has indeed taken place, and is still going on with increasing velocity. The spirit of freedom is in the air. There is a breaking loose from ancient traditions. Ecclesiastical authority is

becoming less and less recognized. This is just what we find foretold in the little work on the "Last Judgment," where we read that, "henceforth the man of the Church will be in a freer state of thinking on matters of faith; that is, on spiritual things which relate to heaven, because spiritual liberty has been restored to him" (73). In consequence of this freedom the irrational tenets of former generations are ceasing to be believed. Calvinism is openly rejected by the very congregations which once subscribed to it as their creed. The Bible, as an authentic revelation of Divine truth, is more and more called in question. The possibility of the virgin birth is more and more doubted and denied. The whole world of Protestantism is doctrinally at sea, and apparently approaching a condition when the only bond of cohesion among its various sects will be their unbelief. Nor is the Roman Catholic Church without its signs of disintegration. The recent fulminations of the Pope against "Modernism" show plainly the alarm which is felt lest the foundations of the old faith be undermined; while the hardly less recent rupture between the French government and the Vatican gives fresh emphasis to the fact that the Papal authority is ceasing to be regarded with the old-time fear and veneration. Clearly, then, a process of vastation, or an emptying out of the false opinions and standards of the past, is everywhere going on.

But how is it with the acceptance of New-Church truth? To what extent can it be truly said that the distinctive doctrines which we profess are believed in the religious bodies around us? Take, for example, the three essentials of the church as they are formulated in the work on the "Divine Providence"; namely, "the acknowledgment of the Lord's Divinity, the acknowledgment of the holiness of the Word, and the life which is called charity" (260). Apply these three as tests of latter-day Christianity, and what is the result?

By the Lord's Divinity, in the New-Church sense, is meant that Jesus Christ is God manifest. Outside of Him there is no God. He is the one true object of man's worship. Where

in Christendom is this doctrine definitely taught? In which of the churches in our communities are prayers offered to Him alone? The fact is that Divinity in any sense appears to be less ascribed to Him than it was a hundred years ago. As was previously said, men bearing the Christian name are coming more and more to doubt whether He was even the Son of God in a manner that was exceptional. Preachers who cherish and express such doubts are to be found in every denomination; and their number is constantly increasing.

So is it with regard to the holiness of the Scriptures. The bare mention of the term "Higher Criticism" is enough to prove this statement. For it is a matter of common knowledge that the scrutiny to which the Bible has been subjected by that criticism has robbed it of its ancient authority and eminence. It is no longer considered the Word of God, in the sense of being divinely inspired, and the special medium of God's thoughts. Rather is it looked upon by a growing number merely as a collection of sacred literature, finite and fallible. Few, apparently, are the devout Bible readers, such as abounded in the days of our fathers. The distinctive teaching of the New Church that the written Word is Divine truth itself, and has a spiritual sense, by virtue of which it is divinely inspired, and holy in every expression, is as far as possible from modern ways of thinking, and awakens no favorable response. The difficulties presented in the literal sense of Scripture are seen plainly enough; but as yet the only visible effect of them is darkness and chaos. False conceptions are disappearing in a kind of general disruption; but where are the true ones which must take their place? None of us know how much longer we shall have to wait before they are recognized.

As for a life of charity, let each one judge for himself what progress it has made, or is making. If, as we believe, that life consists in shunning evils because they are sins against God, in discharging faithfully the duties of one's station, in doing good without the thought of any reward except the joy of being useful and bringing happiness to others, we surely cannot claim that

it prevails to any great extent. We see men divided into hostile camps, rich against poor, employers against employed, each class contending for its so-called rights; but where do we see the unconstrained delight of joyous, mutual service? Natural benevolence is doubtless on the increase. Human beings the world over are coming into closer relations with each other. The millenium is approaching; but who shall say that it has yet arrived? Old conditions are breaking up. The very ground is trembling under our feet. But can we call this seething ferment, full as it may be of future promise, the actual coming of the New Jerusalem? Surely there can be but one answer to this question. The end is not yet. The new heaven is being formed, and the new earth is descending as rapidly as it can; but the states of men cannot be changed any faster than men themselves permit.

What language could more strikingly depict the existing state of things than the graphic prophecy of Isaiah? "He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night." We are taught here that

morning stands for the Lord's coming, and then enlightenment and salvation, thus for a new church; night for the state of man and of the church at that time, that they were in mere falsities from evil. It is said the morning watch, because the night was divided into watches, of which the last of the night and the first of the day was the morning watch. (*Arcana Coelestia*, 8211.)

"The last of the night and the first of the day!" Is not that our exact position? The morning cometh, but the night still lingers. Yea, the faint glimmering of the dawn brings to view some of the night's horrors which were previously unseen. Or, to lay aside metaphor, the gradual oncoming of truth reveals the interior state of the church, making known its insufficiency and emptiness. But this is no cause for discouragement. It is a part of the necessary process through which a new day is born. The great transcendent fact of all is that "the morning cometh."

Full of hope and comfort and wondrously in accord with existing circumstances is the instruction which we have about the church in the wilderness. Some of this teaching has been already quoted. We have seen that the woman fleeing into the wilderness, as described in the twelfth chapter of the Revelation, signifies the New Church at first among a few. But still further we are told about the assistance which she would receive during that period. Even the wilderness itself would serve for her relief. "The serpent," so we read, "cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood." And this means, as we are taught, "reasonings from falsities in abundance to destroy the Church," (Apocalypse Revealed, 563). But in the next verse it is said, "The earth helped the woman; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood, which the dragon cast out of his mouth." Of this passage we have the following most remarkable explanation. It signifies, as we are told, that:—

Those who are of a church that is not in truths afforded assistance, and did not receive the crafty reasonings of those who were in faith separated from charity.

Still further we read:—

This is evident from the signification of the earth that helped the woman, as meaning a church which is not in truths, for here the earth means the earth of the wilderness, into which the woman fled, and where she had a place prepared of God. The above is evident also from the signification of helping the woman, as meaning to afford assistance to the New Church which is called the Holy Jerusalem; also from the signification of opening her mouth and swallowing up the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth, as meaning the keen reasonings of those who were in faith separated from charity; for the river of waters which the dragon cast out of his mouth signifies keen reasonings from falsities, . . . and to open the mouth and swallow in reference to the church that is signified by the earth, signifies to take away; and, as a thing is taken away when it is not received, it signifies not to receive. Such must be the meaning of all this. It is said above that the woman fled into the wilderness where she hath a place prepared of God, and afterwards that she received the wings of an eagle, and flew to her place, which signifies that the church of the New Jerusalem

is to tarry among those who are in the doctrine of faith separate while it grows to its fulness, until provision is made for it among many. But in that church are dragons who separate faith from good works not only in doctrine but also in life; but the others in the same church who live a life of faith, which is charity, are not dragons, although they are among them; for they do not know otherwise than that it is according to doctrine that faith produces fruits which are good works, and that the faith which justifies and saves is believing what the Word teaches and doing it. The dragons have wholly different sentiments; but what these are the others do not comprehend, and because they do not comprehend them, they do not accept them. This makes clear that a church consisting of those who are not dragons is meant by the earth that helped the woman, and swallowed up the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth. . . . Hence it is that the New Church which is the Holy Jerusalem is helped and made to grow. (*Apocalypse Explained*, 764.)

It is impossible to imagine a more exact and truthful account of present conditions than is contained in this passage. The state of the Christian Church is, indeed, as has been shown, like a wilderness. It is barren and void of truth. The old dogmas have been rejected, and nothing has been accepted in their place. But all efforts to force upon the minds of men the former falsities are vain and impotent. Those falsities are swallowed up and disappear like water sinking into sand. The liberal spirit which nowadays prevails insists on freedom in religion as in all things else. It is of little use to argue with the generality of people that a man is saved by faith alone, or that the quality of his life has nothing to do with his present or future happiness. Such teaching in most cases is spoken to deaf ears. Thus the earth of the wilderness unconsciously helps the woman, and the serpent's machinations are foiled.

Another prophecy of exceeding interest is contained in the explanation which is given us of the parable of the fig-tree in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew. The passage is: "Now learn a parable of the fig-tree. When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." These words signify, as we are told, "the first thing of a new church; the fig-tree is good

of the natural, her branch is affection therefrom, and its leaves are truths." Then follows this explanation:—

When a new church is created by the Lord, there then appears, first of all, good of the natural, that is, good in the external form, with its affections and truths. By good of the natural is not meant good into which man is born, or which he derives from his parents, but good which is spiritual in its origin. Into this one is not born, but is led by the Lord through knowledges of good and truth. Therefore until man is in this good, that is, in spiritual good, he is not a man of the church, however from inborn good he may appear to be. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 4231.)

Elsewhere we are taught to the same effect, that the New Church in its beginning will be external (*Apocalypse Explained*, 403). Goodness on the natural plane of life will be its marked characteristic. Its earliest developments will be those of outward kindness and benevolence. Looking at the church in a large way, without reference to ecclesiastical boundary lines, can we not truly say that there never was a period in the history of the world when the hearts of men were so keenly alive as they now are to the need of relieving suffering, of dispelling ignorance, and of promoting the conditions which make for bodily health and comfort? Hospitals, schools, colleges, homes for the aged, homes for the blind, charitable institutions of every description, abound to an extent which former ages never dreamed of. And still they go on increasing without limit, while rich men pour out money like water for their establishment and support. Even churches, in many instances, are beginning to regard these benevolent activities as their principal work. Lacking a distinct Gospel message, they make the betterment of outward human conditions their chief cause for being. Is not this a most distinctive sign of the times? Is it not the veritable fruit of the fig-tree,—natural good from a spiritual origin,—spreading throughout the world? Ought we not to know, from the parable so wondrously fulfilled, that the summer is nigh?

Coincident with this remarkable phenomenon is the no less marvellous one whereby the ends of the earth are coming into

closest touch with each other. The greater facilities for travel, and the improved means of communication, are bringing all the races of mankind together. Can any one doubt that thus the foundations of a grand universal church are to be laid? The church of the Israelites, though serving a needful purpose in its day, was confined to a single family. The Christian Church was wider, yet sadly limited by its claim that none could be saved outside its own fold, and that faith, not life, opened the doors of heaven to men. But the church of the future will be as broad as the world itself. They shall gather from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, into the Holy City. Must not such a church necessarily grow slowly? Must it not be growing all the time beneath the surface, in ways which we are not aware of? Must it not, in the nature of things, from its very vastness, baffle human calculations? Truly, there is no cause to be discouraged. The prophecies are being fulfilled. Our part is to go forward, hopeful, joyous, courageous, each one doing what he can to hasten the happy day, doubting not that the Lord will keep His promises, even though it may sometimes be needful for us to call to remembrance His injunction regarding these days in which we live: "In your patience possess ye your souls."

JAMES REED.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

AMONG the questions which can properly be brought before us as a religious body, there are few more vital, more far-reaching, or more difficult of solution, than the social question. The problem is as profound as the depths of the human heart, which the prophet declares to be deceitful above all things. Its solution calls for all the light which human thought and experience can furnish, as well as the profoundest self-exploration. It is well in our search for light to see the subject as others see it. And so I propose first to present some of the thoughts of two recent writers. The one is Prof. Shailer Matthews, of the Chicago University, who writes upon "The Church and the Changing Order"; the other is Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, of the Rochester Theological Seminary, whose theme is "Christianity and the Social Crisis." Both are Baptists, both trained ministers, and both professors of church history and historical theology.

Remembering that these works are only typical of a general trend in the churches, let us bring before our minds the substance of some of their leading positions, and first that of Professor Matthews.

The church, he says, has always inclined to follow the intellectual philosophy of its day. It cannot now stand aloof. A conflict in theology is inevitable. The old Christian understanding of the Bible is based upon archaic conceptions of God. A new theology is needed, but not a new gospel. Culture cannot displace religion. It furnishes ideals, but not forces. The "higher criticism" has come to stay, but not its negative element, which tends to reduce the gospel to ethics and to deny the divine birth and resurrection of Jesus, and to remove from the church the influence of the thought of immortality. Amateur philanthropy, of which the world is full, can never fill the place

of religion. The great elemental things—food, war, money—have bound men together in families, communities, and nations; but true religion as a universal spirit should bind all mankind together. Christianity, if true, makes one incapable of separation from his fellows. The habits of most men of wealth, being unsocial, are an obstacle to the extension of the gospel. The church must stand for life, not philosophy. As far as it stands for philosophy it tends to division. It is not political. It is dynamic, not regulative. It must not vote away the saloon and give the poor man nothing in its place. It need not destroy social classes, but only their artificial barriers. Nations may exist, but not war. Capitalism displaced feudalism about the middle of the eighteenth century, but now needs to be itself changed in its spirit. A new order of things in the business world has come to stay, but its abuses must be corrected. As it is to-day the good man and neighbor will be guilty of acts as a member of a corporation which he would never do as an individual, and which are violations of fundamental morality, and destructive of the Christian love of the common welfare. The Protestant bodies as a whole are capitalistic, and tend to build up a class separate from the masses. The labor and socialistic bodies have true ideals, but lack a religious basis. They are alienated from the church, regarding it as we regard old armor and spinning wheels, practically useless. The church member is not expected to obey reforming legislation. He is not absent from legislative lobbies. The masses have become at least indifferent to the church. How shall the church meet the situation? Not by an improved individualism merely, although this is vital to any real Christianization of the world. The kingdom of God is first within, and so is individual, and is the only real dynamic force; but it cannot, must not, be indifferent to public wrongs. The church will not preach politics, but it will utter a message which will inspire a true citizenship of universal love. The minister must be left free to speak his message and not be muzzled by unworthy fears. The church has trained the individual consciousness, but now it must train

the individual to think of his relation to society. It must stand for fraternity. It must insist upon the socialization of privilege. Economic oppression must vanish. A new social consciousness needs to be born. The church can cultivate it if it will. The dreadful fallacy, so common in a republic, that because the people are sovereign, every man is sovereign, must be overcome. The only sovereign is the truth of universal love, for God is love. The church has neglected the vital message. It has inveighed against smoking or card playing, but not against theft. Theft, in various forms, is an almost universal evil. The church has been "undergoing the temptation of Christ to prostitute its supreme mission to some inferior good." A tidal wave of materialism envelops it. The gambling spirit, the vice of savage tribes, is actively present in the business world. Many who still retain true ideals feel compelled against their better selves to follow the universal habit of desire to obtain, through methods of concealment or deceit, an unearned increment. The term "deceitfulness of riches," used by our Master, expresses the simple truth respecting the materialistic spirit. The covetous man is deeply deceived. Unlike other sinners, he does not even know that he is on the downward way. St. Francis Xavier said that men had confessed to him all the sins he knew and some he had never imagined, but none of his own accord had ever confessed that he was covetous. Spiritual idealism needs to be brought into the production of wealth as much as into its distribution. The church can, if it will, meet the situation, but it demands a radical change of spirit and method.

So far, in the main, with slight interpretations, we hear the message of Professor Matthews. And now let us hear, in brief and in part, from the more theological professor, whose one central theme is Christianity as a social body. Here, again, we need a definition. Socialism, as now commonly interpreted, means an outward, human law, a levelling, compelling system. The socialism of Christianity means the love of God and the neighbor, beginning in the heart, descending into the plane of the world, and bringing it into harmony and union with the kingdom of God within.

Judaism, Christianity's predecessor and preparation, began with the social idea. The opening word of God to Abraham, its founder, was, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The laws of Moses looked to a common as distinct from an individual good. The seventh year was a year of release for all. The fiftieth or jubilee, which, however, was doubtless but an ideal, and never realized, was to be a season of freedom to all. The poor were always to be cared for. There was to be no gleaning of the corners of the fields in the harvest. The residue was to be left to the poor and unfortunate. The prophets, if Jeremiah be excepted, condemned not merely personal but national evils. "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity!" The oppression of the poor had become a national crime. The well-to-do had separated themselves, obtained possession of the land, and exploited the people for their own personal gain. The Messianic prophecy told of good news to the poor, the broken-hearted, the captives, the mourners.

And such, only in a profounder sense, was the Christian message. Jesus has been claimed both as a reformer and a socialist, but He was neither; yet His vision, beginning in heaven, included the earth, and thus the ideal of both reformer and socialist. The kingdom of God or of heaven proclaimed by John the Baptist meant the end of injustice and oppression.

While true that the Master declared to Pilate that His kingdom was not of this world, yet this does not do away with His declaration that He came to fulfil, not to destroy, the law and the prophets; and still less does it nullify the words and demands of His universal prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as in heaven." His words to Pilate mean that He was not a mere reformer, but that His kingdom was a spiritual kingdom, whose power must be brought down to earth. The spirituality, as well as practicality of His message, is seen in the comparison of the Sermon on the Mount as found in the two evangelists, Matthew and Luke. In the one we read of the "poor in spirit" and the "hungering and thirsting after right-

eousness"; in the other of the poor in purse and the physically hungry, followed up with woes to the rich, the satiated, the frivolous. And so in a comparison of John and Luke. With the one the message is of eternal life, not God's kingdom on earth; in the other we read exclusively of the rich fool, the unjust steward, and the parable of Dives and Lazarus. In Luke, he who makes a feast must call the poor, the crippled, the lame, the blind. Christianity must include both messages, the inner and the outer, heaven and earth. But great as is the change which the gospels demand of human nature, it is not to be expected that it can be all at once accomplished. The gasoline tank of the automobile, if directly fired, would tear everything to pieces; but with a series of small explosions it carries the heavy machine to the summit of the hill.

Why, then, if the gospel was intended to strike at all selfish, individualistic exploitation, was it not realized in the early church? First and chiefly because the Roman government would not have tolerated any practical interference with its privilege. Again, the early church almost universally believed in the Saviour's second advent as liable at any moment, making any great effort to establish a new social system unnecessary. Yet the early church was democratic, and composed mostly of poor people who lived for each other. Indeed, the great practical purpose or use of the organization was not, as now, to carry on formal worship and furnish preachers, but mostly to care for the poor and suffering.

But after the conversion of Constantine, when the church gained its freedom, why did it not labor for the coming of the kingdom to earth? There are different replies, but chiefly these: the wealth and power of the world continued long in the hands of unbelievers; asceticism and vows of poverty drove many away from the world; the Græco-Roman religious spirit was permeated with what may be called "other-worldliness," a species of philosophic interest in immortality, shaping by degrees the interpretation of the gospel; and at last the world gained a large control of the church body, substituting eccle-

siasticism, sacramentalism, and formalism for the democracy of the early days.

The recent industrial revolution has magnified existing evils. It has produced a caste system almost fatal to Christian brotherhood; the extreme division of labor has destroyed pride of good work; it has produced physical decline among the workers, and has been attended by a moral decline among the captains of industry and their retainers who are striving for supremacy of wealth and power. Christianity as a life is at stake. Even the church is largely commercialized, and its organizations controlled by what are called "business principles," and ministers valued according to their ability to attract wealth rather than their capacity to cultivate the spiritual character.

What can we do?

Professor Rauchenbusch does not attempt to answer the broad question, but seeks a reply to the inquiry, how can the latent moral forces be aroused, and in what directions can they be exerted.

We cannot, he maintains, go back to the old ways. We cannot practise the Mosaic land system, adapted to a bucolic people. We cannot establish communistic colonies. Neither can the church attempt to control politics or create insurance societies or carry on any form of secular business.

But we can and should return to the early belief in the coming of the kingdom of God on earth. As individualism requires faith and repentance of personal sins, so any social regeneration demands a recognition of social sins and faith in their removal. We must see evil as it really is and not idealize it. For instance, look upon war not in its glorious "pomp and circumstance," but in the light of the horrors of the battlefield. There must be an intelligent understanding of the fictions of capitalism. The idea so widely spread abroad, that the poor are such mainly through their own fault, or that the great fault is with immigration, needs correction.

There must be a regenerated personality among the leaders of men in the world and church. Such will be listened to.

Their example will become contagious. The ministers must speak boldly upon questions of public morality. But they must speak, not ignorantly, despairingly, or impatiently, but intelligently, hopefully, lovingly. Partisanship, bitterness, narrowness must cease. The people must realize that what are becoming known as business malefactors are such largely as victims of social forces. The whole community shares the guilt of the individual briber or promoter. The minister must make a great effort to be fair to the poor. He must know their literature, their ways of thinking, their daily lives. He must speak in advance of public wrongs, not after they become political watchwords. The great communistic elements—the home, the school, the church, as well as the state or nation—should be treated as the rightful abodes of the Master.

The church cannot lead back to past conditions, or follow methods adapted to them, or make the church the centre of a new social machinery, or postpone the Christianization of society to a future millenium. But “the force of religion can be best applied to social renewal by sending its spiritual power along the existing and natural relations of men, to direct them to truer ends and govern them by higher motives.”

In thus excluding the church from any direct interference with politics, and limiting its sphere to the inner plane of idealism or dynamic force, the two professors appear to be in substantial accord. But the Rochester professor, emphasizing the doctrine of secondary causes, holds that dynamic or spiritual forces alone are not sufficient to bring about the great revolution in the world's industries which the common good requires. There must be a class created, moved by a common need. For example: the French revolution, he maintains, was not the work of an impoverished and hence feeble class, although this element came to the surface in the disorders of the time, but the real cause lay in the rise of the great middle class, or bourgeoisie, including the rapidly growing business or capitalistic body, which demanded justice and liberty for itself, in place of the privilege enjoyed only by the few. Until that class was

strong enough to assert itself the change could not be brought about. And so to-day there must be an assertion of their natural rights by a large class of people before the idealism of the dreamer, or the prophetism of the church, can exert its power. (Or, if I may add a Bible illustration, "truth" must "spring out of the earth" before "righteousness shall look down from heaven.") Rauschenbusch sees in the great labor and socialistic movements the probable forces which, in the evolution of the race, will displace the capitalism of the eighteenth century, and bring about the outward conditions in which the plant of Christian love will find itself no longer an exotic, but at home in its native soil.

Listen to this from the Professor:—

The present movement for federal and state interference and control over corporations, of which President Roosevelt is the most eminent exponent and leader, is an effort to reassert the ownership and mastership of the people, and to force these stewards of public powers back into the position of public servants. The next decade will probably show whether they are willing to take the position of well-paid servants, and cease from ousting the owner. If not, the people will have to say, "Render the account of thy stewardship, for thou canst no longer be steward."

These two works, written by churchmen, are doubtless representative. They tell of a "changing order" and a "social crisis," present in the world as well as in the church. Whether the church will be able to recognize and meet the situation aright appears to be a question with both authors. Both recognize that the church is so affected by worldly or social forces as to be largely indifferent to the needs of the great masses of men, but that if it will, it can take the lead in directing the forces that are active in the impending crisis. As New-churchmen, what is our duty in this crisis, either as a general body or as individual ministers or laymen?

As a church body we should all doubtless agree with the writers under review, that we can take no part in direct legislation, at least outside of what the literal commandments of God imperatively require, and then only in the form of reso-

lutions or recommendations or petitions to the law-making power. As ministers, while not at liberty to make the pulpit a political platform, we are at liberty, and it is our duty, to apply the divine law to current affairs, on the one condition that the true end or spirit of preaching, namely, to lead by the truth in the way of heaven, shall be kept uppermost. As laymen or as citizens it is our plain duty to bring ourselves, day by day, in will, in thought, in act, nearer into harmony with the words we utter daily, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, so upon the earth."

While true indeed that we, possessing a magnificent outlook into the spiritual realm, with the bright vision of the eternal kingdom of God before us, cannot feel the same anxiety about the conditions of this world as those do whose idea of reality stops at the grave; yet our thought of religion as relating to life, and of life here, when freely chosen, being the arbiter of our life hereafter, should, even from the point of view of self-interest, lead us to work for the kingdom of God on earth.

The great, the underlying principle, revealed to the New Church, namely, heaven as one grand body of humanity, in which each organ, great or small, works for the universal welfare, and in which each is animated by a love for the common good, is the principle which we as New-churchmen are bound to apply to this question, and to abide by the results. There may, indeed, be honest differences of opinion as to what will be for the common good. A deep study of the question with an open mind and heart may lead one to believe in Christian socialism, and another to hold, with President Baer, that God intends for some to be wealthy and strong, and others to be poor and weak; but the simple question for a New-churchman is, "What does the universal good require?" Protestantism has regarded the salvation of the individual. The New-Church doctrine and philosophy require, whenever the interests of self and of others are brought into contrast or conflict, that the selfish interests shall yield. And let it be said right here, lest it should be overlooked, that the practice of so yielding, when

it becomes habitual, must bring a joy, a blessing, all its own,—a joy bestowed by Him who said, “For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.” Through obedience to this truth of the common welfare, abstract and cold and empty as it may sound at first, we shall gradually be led to Him.

It was said at first that the question is as profound as the human heart. Human laws alone cannot solve the social question. Neither socialism nor any other merely outward system can bring in the kingdom of God. The prophet declares the human heart to be deceitful and incurable or incorrigible, except by the Lord as man obeys His commands. Psychology’s late word, in so far accordant with the New Church, is that the will is the man, that “man is worth just what his will is worth.” Are we settling this social question by our own selfish will? Are we refusing to ask how the law of truth applies? Are we determined to follow the law of our own selfish, worldly interest? Is it this secret, deceitful, incurable will which makes us adopt the theory that selfishness is necessary to the progress of the world, or that evolution will work out the solution at last? A right will should make us banish all theories born of selfish desire, and to seek that state of heart which the divine word sets before us when it lifts up our eyes to the mountain peaks of truth,—that second birth which comes, not of hereditary nobility, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. In the everlasting fight between the inner and outer, the visible and invisible life, we must seek not merely an intellectual or merely a practical ideal, but above and within all a willingness that the Lord’s will prevail. Even so, the devil will go with us to the temple pinnacle, or to the mountain top, and make us claim the kingdom and the glory; and not until we call him by his right name, and bid him go hence, shall we have the light and the power of God.

But setting aside this thought of the deep source of social injustice as springing from the evil within the human heart,

look for a moment at the other aspect, endorsed by Professor Rauschenbusch, that men are what they are largely as a result of their environment. The poor, and even the criminals, are largely such through a wrong social system. And, moreover, the Professor claims that even those who would be honest are compelled by the necessities of their environment to do what they would not; that they are slaves of a system which puts dishonesty and deceit at a premium in the market. Many affirm this; others deny it, citing such cases as that of Marshall Field. This question ought to be answered once for all for our own people; also why men who are honest as individuals are dishonest as parts of a corporation. If it be true that the present system compels dishonesty, surely it ought to be changed.

Closely connected with this is the question of speculation as contrasted with business as a use to the community, and thus in harmony with the common good. Gambling, in its boldest form, has been banished from its last great stronghold in this country. But how about the spirit of the stock exchange? How about that desire in the human heart to get without giving any just equivalent? Does it result in benefit to the mass of mankind? Is it useful to the individual? These latter questions ought to be answered in theory by science, psychology, and history, and in practice by the leaders in the industrial world.

But suppose for the moment that the system cannot be changed. Suppose that there must be masters and servants, rich and poor. Acknowledging at once that the uses of some require much more than the uses of others, acknowledging that socialism, through its compulsory levelling system, is probably wrong, surely it remains true that the extravagances, the display, the exhibitions of pride and power which we are witnessing everywhere to-day, are utterly foreign to the heavenly law of regard for the common good. Every real New-churchman will seek to hold all he possesses in trust for the common welfare. He will refrain from any unnecessary display; he will keep self in the background; he will so live that the community,

seeing his good works, will be led to give glory, not to him, but to the Master whose law he tries to follow, and who is Himself the servant of all. Certainly every New-churchman can be of service by leading a simple, consistent life.

Nor can any exhibition of liberality or philanthropy atone for wrongly acquired wealth. The law of accumulation should harmonize with the law of distribution. The public press occupies much space in glorifying the princely liberality of men whose substance, according to common belief, has been largely a result of unjust methods. Not only does this kind of philanthropy fail to change the character of the giver, but there is grave question whether, in the long run, such gifts redound to the real well being of the community. I am not aware that the position of Thomas Buckle of half a century ago, which covers the subject, has ever been overthrown.

The power of the great socialistic movement, however wrong it may be in its manifestations, lies in its recognition of the common good. Blind and dreamy as it is, yet, as the philosopher Kant said, "a dream which all men dream together, and which they must dream, is no longer a dream, but a reality." Every believer in the New-Church doctrine of heaven, or of the love of the common good, will sympathize with the dream, though not with its fantasies. Always, Professor Rauschenbusch reminds us, the great movements looking to human amelioration spring from the lower social grades. The common people heard the Master gladly. The early church was mainly of the poor. Not only the thought, but the feeling or the wish of social superiority, must be banished sternly from our churches before we can expect life and growth. If there be either social, moral, or intellectual superiority among us, the heavenly law of "noblesse oblige," the law of the cross, should compel those who are superior to labor for those who are below. Nor will any system of charity atone for social separation in the churches, whether the latter be defended by the intellect or only secretly defended by the heart.

While no dream of a heaven on earth can ever displace in

the New-Church mind the grander truth of immortality, yet the true idea of heaven—that is, the love of the common welfare—must always keep alive the desire and effort to realize it here. If our hearts were right we should not rest in our own individual security from the danger of the wolf at the door, or the deeper danger of the spiritual wolf, when just beyond our own walls there is misery and destruction resulting from the rule of unrighteousness. It was David who said, “He who ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.” The word “king” in the Latin language is the word for “right.” The description of the city New Jerusalem, as having its length and breadth equal, means justice, and thus righteousness. If it is to be the glory of the new dispensation to worship the loving and personal Saviour as King of kings, it will be equally its glory to exhibit that love in the service of men. A new consciousness is to be born,—the consciousness of a grand humanity, a consciousness as broad as the earth, as high as the heavens, abstract indeed at first, but growing into clearer outline, until it shall stand forth as an object of human affection,—a human being in the image and likeness of the Master.

But though this be as yet far away, let us look forward to it. If we cannot be optimists, let us at least be meliorists, ever seeking, through our individual effort, to make our own individual lives more free from the rule of self, nor forget that the Divine Providence is over all, the real outcome beyond the grave, and that this world does not end the opportunity of those who in this life have failed to see the light or to obtain justice. (See *Arcana Cœlestia*, 3703, part 19, Potts’ translation.)

I will close this paper with the prelude to Professor Rauschenbusch’s chapter on “The Present Crisis”:—

When the 19th Century died, its spirit descended to the vaulted chamber of the past, where the Spirits of the dead Centuries sit on granite thrones together. When the new comer entered, all turned toward him, and the Spirit of the 18th Century spoke: “Tell thy tale, brother. Give us word of the human kind we left to thee.”

“I am the Spirit of the Wonderful Century. I gave man the mastery over nature. Discoveries and inventions, which lighted the black space of the past like lonely stars, have clustered in a Milky Way of radiance

under my rule. One man does by the touch of his hand what the toil of a thousand slaves never did. Knowledge has unlocked the mines of wealth, and the hoarded wealth of to-day creates the vaster wealth of to-morrow. Man has escaped the slavery of Necessity, and is free.

"I freed the thoughts of men. They face the facts and know. Their knowledge is common to all. The deeds of the East are known in the West at morn. They send their whispers under the seas and across the clouds.

"I broke the chains of bigotry and despotism. I made men free and equal. Every man feels the worth of his manhood.

"I have touched the summit of history. I did for mankind what none of you did before. They are rich. They are wise. They are free."

The Spirits of the dead Centuries sat silent, with troubled eyes. At last the Spirit of the First Century spoke for all:

"We all spoke proudly when we came here in the flush of our deeds, and thou more proudly than all. But as we sit and think of what was before us, and what has come after us, shame and guilt bear down our pride. Your words sound as if the redemption of man had come at last. Has it come?

"You have made men rich. Tell us, is none in pain with hunger to-day, and none in fear of hunger for to-morrow? Do all children grow up fair of limb and trained for thought and action? Do none die before their time? Has the mastery of nature made men free to enjoy their lives and loves, and to live the higher life of the mind?

"You have made men wise. Are they wise or cunning? Have they learned to restrain their bodily passions? Have they learned to deal with their fellows in justice and love?

"You have set them free. Are there none, then, who toil for others against their will? Are all men free to do the work they love best?

"You have made men one. Are there no barriers of class to keep man and maid apart? Does none rejoice in the cause that makes the many moan? Do men no longer spill the blood of men for their ambition and the sweat of men for their greed?"

As the Spirit of the 19th Century listened, his head sank to his breast.

"Your shame is already upon me. My great cities are as yours were. My millions live from hand to mouth. Those who toil longest have least. My thousands sink exhausted before their days are half spent. My human wreckage multiplies. Class faces class in sullen distrust. Their freedom and knowledge has only made men keener to suffer. Give me a seat among you, and let me think why it has been so."

The others turned to the Spirit of the First Century. "Your promised redemption is long in coming."

"But it will come," he replied.

JOHN GODDARD.

THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF MEMORIZING THE WORD.

IN the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy we meet with this striking charge, "Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shalt talk of them"; and it leads us, at the outset of this paper, to raise and answer a few important queries.

What is the foundation of all the manhood or womanhood that we or our children can hope to attain? The Word of God. What is the basis of all reformation and regeneration—all true growth? Knowledge of the Word of God. What is the first and strongest foundation for victories over evil as boys and girls come into the combats of mature life? The Word of God as it is stored in the memory. What is the memory? It is the reservoir whence we draw the water of life. It is the armory of our weapons of defence. It is the storehouse of all our constructive tools. It is the great bin where is to be gathered the corn which feeds our souls. Is the memory cultivated and the storehouse well filled? Yes, but with everything but the Word of God. Children seem to have an exhaustless memory of rag-time songs, popular epigrams, catchy phrases, and sporting news; but dip for living water and the reservoir is nearly dry.

It is said that the average college student is more ignorant of the Bible than of almost any other book. Boys and girls just entering their teens know scarcely anything of the Bible. "If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?" That is, if children are robbed of this knowledge in the memory of God's Word, where do the righteous lessons taught by the parents and teachers get their power and efficacy? How can they get a root-hold of a divine sub-soil in the child's mind to find nourishment?

A great deal is said at the present day of the lack of interest and appreciation on the part of children in religious matters,

and especially in Bible study. Children come to Sunday-school unprepared in their lessons, not even able to distinguish the era of Abraham or Moses from that of David or Isaiah, and the parents are despondent and the teachers lose heart. The teaching loses force because it lacks rock-foundation strength, and inevitably it becomes flabby with vague generalizations.

A large part of the Sunday-school teaching in the Protestant church is but a mass of weak and sometimes false and dangerous moralizing which rests almost entirely in the plane of sentiment. The natural result follows in the weakness which is so apparent in the youth of to-day. In the New Church we know something at least of the significance and the untold power of the Word. Hence when we find in the very beginning of Israel's history as a nation the command given by the Lord that His laws should be taught "diligently" to children, and that the Israelites should "talk" of them morning, noon, and night, we know something of the hidden reason. It was in a large part that those children should have full storehouses of that which was most needed and full reservoirs of that for which they would thirst.

The complaint against the child and youth of to-day is unfair to them, for it is a complaint that they do not produce that which they do not possess, and which we have failed to give them. In allowing ourselves to go beyond the letter of the Word with children before they are thoroughly grounded in the letter itself, we are brushing aside the vital point that "all power rests in ultimates," and that the whole of the divine power of the Word as it is to work in their minds and hearts rests in the letter—the ultimate of the Word.

We cannot expect them to have power against evil, or great strength of character, or strong hold of truth when they lack the possession of those things which alone give power and strength.

Furthermore, we forget that the developing man in the child is first led "through faith of the memory" (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 30), which we call scientific faith, a term meaning intellectual

belief and trust in the knowledges stored in the memory. And again there is this other fact which we are passing by in our practice, that "the internal (or spiritual) man cannot have communication with the external or natural man until recipient vessels have been formed which are of the memory," and the internal life "becomes more and more distinct, as the vessels of the exterior memory are formed." (*Ibid.*, 1900.)

Does this not make emphatic the need of training the memory of the child in the letter of the Word? The writer has nothing to say against the value of doctrinal teaching, or the value of opening the spiritual meaning of the Word to the young at the right time and in the right place, but he would emphasize the point that from earliest childhood our children should be led to memorize passages of the Word, until the memory is stored with them. This is the first duty of the parent, and it is likewise the first duty of the Sunday-school teacher. It should never be passed by to teach the moral, or even the spiritual, points of a lesson until the scholar shows that he has thoroughly learned the verses assigned for the day. Cardinal Gibbons recently said that the addresses and speeches of our public men are far inferior and weaker to-day than forty years ago, because men know less of the Bible, and seldom quote its passages. Each passage of the Word illustrates some law or principle of life. It has a force and power with which nothing else can compare, but if a man has no knowledge of the Word stored in his memory where is he to get his strength or his real weapons of defense? If the power of the Word properly used is very great in a public address upon moral and civil issues, it is still greater upon the internal evils and fallacies of a man's own character. When thoroughly stored in the memory texts and passages from the Word are forever at hand. Ten thousand times—in temptation—they come to the front to help the boy or man to down the particular evil that is assaulting him. They buoy up his courage, preserve his ideals, keep alive his zeal, and impart to him inspiration from on high, where without them he would be defenceless. And how do they do this? Why the infinite power of

the Lord Himself is in each and every particular of the Word, and when the memory is stored full of these particulars they serve the child's internal sight as a plane of objects from which he can select such things as will strengthen him and promote his wisdom, for he, with his understanding, looks down into the memory, and selects such things as agree with his purpose and conscience, and uses them for the preservation of his character and life, and as he uses them they pass from the external memory into the internal memory and become forever a part of his life (*Arcana Coelestia*, 9723). And still more, as he selects these things from the Word and honestly tries to use them, the Divine of the Lord that is in them is imparted to him, and he is nourished and strengthened for deeper conflicts.

Repeatedly the press has told us in recent months that the church is losing its hold upon men, and that the people are turning away from her ministrations. But if young people have not had the Word—not a lot of morals based on the Word—but the Word itself implanted, rooted, and grounded in them, what is there to hold them to the church or to bring any response on their part? In playing a game we would never think of giving those who propose to contest in it a lot of reflections about the game, and then putting them into it without their knowing the rules of the game. We would naturally expect them to be defeated. It is so in regard to Christian life. The Word gives the rules of life. Our moral reflections, our spiritual lessons, our teachings of correspondence, have but vague, confusing and transitory results if there is not a sub-soil of knowledge of the Word itself stored in the memory as a basis for those things to grow in that the divine rules of life may be thoroughly known. For this very reason we are taught that a large part of the Word is written in narrative form, especially adapted to childhood's states to assist in this effort to store the memory, implant the remains for after growth, and give a living knowledge of the truth. Hence parents have the divine command to teach the Lord's Word "diligently" unto their children. If a thorough canvas could be made of so-called Christian or religious homes,

in the New Church as well as elsewhere, so that the actual conditions could be clearly revealed, it is probable that in over 90 per cent. of the homes it would be found that distinct teaching of the Word—if there is any of it—is relegated to a brief period on Saturday, or a hurried repetition of passages on Sunday morning. And as for talking the Word, “When thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up”—that is, as a living thing—the most important and vital in the life, why this talking of the Word is exceedingly rare. Of course, when the children come to Sunday-school there is lack of vital interest in the lesson from the Word. It is a dead issue to them, the various incidents and details of the lessons are a lot of dry bones which they listlessly pick over and place in new positions, and those bones have to be clothed with the flesh and blood of a good deal of living experience, and animated by a very deep spirit of life on the teacher’s part to make them assume life to the scholar. To conclude, we would emphasize the point that the most important work which can be done by the home, the church, or the Sunday-school, for the first fourteen years of a child’s life, or the second fourteen if the first fourteen has been neglected, is the storing of the Word itself in the memory until thousands of passages are as familiar to him as

“Break, break, break

At the foot of thy crags O Sea!”

or Kipling’s poem, “Lest we forget,” has been familiar to the minds of children who have had to “speak pieces” in school. We have improved, enlarged, and refined our modes and methods until the fundamentals are ground down to a very small compass. Let the parents and teachers realize the vital importance of the fundamentals and return to work of that kind which shall be thorough. Let us stop trying to teach and expecting children to learn and love spiritual algebra and geometry, and first ground them in the addition, subtraction, and multiplication, the percentage and square root, of the Word

itself. Then, when they reach the proper stage, the algebra and geometry will be but the natural and orderly sequence which they will take with avidity.

If the father and the mother find the details of the Word so vital that they cannot help talking of them, that vitality of interest will be imparted to the child. There will be nothing on the part of parents or child that will be forced or perfunctory, but there will be an unconscious and orderly growth, and the question of interest in Sunday-school lessons or in the church will disappear.

The need of a full memory is further emphasized from the fact that it is the first foundation for faith in divine things. From the knowledge of those things stored in the memory the child begins to believe. The internal, quickened by the Lord, can communicate through these knowledges with the child's external. Over and over his understanding looks down into the memory and finds things there to guide him, check him, and defend him in time of danger, and as he uses them his faith increases, his character strengthens, his internal opens wider to heaven, the teachings of the church become real, and the whole Word lives.

In any question which arises in regard to our children's growth toward heaven, let us first see if this implanting of the Word has been properly done, and if as parents and teachers we have taught the Lord's laws "diligently," and have "talked" of them as we have sat in our homes, as we have walked by the way, as we have laid down to rest and as we have arisen to our daily tasks. All this is what grounds our children in the Lord's laws, for "more to be desired are they than gold, yea than much fine gold."

GEORGE S. WHEELER.

BACKSLIDERS.

THE word backsliding presents before our minds the picture of a person climbing a hill who fails in his continuous effort to ascend and slips back. Looking beyond the material forms we think of one imbued with a high and noble purpose who temporarily through discouragement or for some other reason abandons that purpose. The life that leads from earth to heaven is one of steady ascent. The spiritual life is one of high ideals and motives. To become convinced of the truth and goodness of these ideals and to start upon their realization and afterwards to turn from them is to backslide. So our dictionaries tell us that to backslide, in the common use of the term, is "to fall away, especially to abandon generally the faith and practice of a religion that has been professed."

We have the backsliders, like the poor, ever with us. This particular form of sinfulness is very common. Probably no communion of Christian faith is free from its own examples of this particular kind of dereliction. If in the New Church we still retained the interest and coöperation of all those who were brought up in the faith and at some period of their lives were attached to it, our societies would be far larger and stronger than they are. When intimate friends become alienated, or members of the same social or religious fraternity part company, the coldness that springs up is marked. Aversion begets continued inattention and neglect. It often happens that the person who loses interest in our common faith is ignored by us and left to pursue solitary and alone his seeming backward path. Thinking of backsliders is an unpleasant subject, and we drop it and them from our minds and hearts as soon as possible. So large a class of individuals should not thus be left to walk alone. While they remain in the community with us we have still pressing and important duties to perform for

them. For this purpose it is important to know all we can of the mental and affectional state of the backsliders,—its cause and its cure.

Turning from the outward observation of individuals to our own spirits we discover that we are all backsliders in a greater or lesser degree. We have failed to fulfil our early promises of a spiritual life, we have not attained our ideals, we have begun to climb the mountain of the Lord, but have frequently slipped back because of the love of ourselves and the world. Having once seen and tasted something of the light and joy of a spiritual life, it is hard to appeal from our higher to our lower nature and to awaken the old interest and the old enthusiasm that we once felt when we first tasted heavenly joys. The newness is gone, the interest wanes, the affections are irresponsive to new appeals. Serious as are our duties to the outward backslider, those to the inward backslider are more pressing and important because fraught with great and imperative responsibilities, involving the issues of our eternal life. We are tempted to treat our own backsliding habit with the same indifference that we manifest towards the outward backslider. A mental cold shoulder is turned upon the aspirations within that have failed in realization. Hopelessness creeps over us, and like the sleep that precedes freezing we find it easy to succumb to its beguiling but fatal insensibilities. The study of the backsliding habit is then no mere abstraction. It involves the most practical issues of real life in the present.

In examining recently the catalogue of the Boston Public Library but few books were found on this subject. One Andrew Fuller, D.D., a pastor afterwards of a Baptist Church in Kettering, England, in 1802 wrote a little booklet or tract on this subject, which reappeared also in Dr. Fuller's works and was also published in New York and elsewhere in America. A story of a backslider was also found by an anonymous writer, but the reading of the story disclosed nothing of the backslider excepting the title. Dr. Fuller, in his introduction, states that he finds at this time—that is, in 1802—an increasing number

of backsliders, and so feels the need of addressing them. He laments that many are "sunk into Laodicean lukewarmness," and regrets the "prevalent falling away of Christians from the faith." This quaint little volume is entitled "The Backslider, or An Enquiry into the Nature, Symptoms, and Effects of Religious Declension with the Means of Recovery." As this little book of Dr. Fuller's is the only one found treating of this subject a brief resumé of its teachings may be of interest. He cites Saul, Ahithophel, and Judas as examples of the backsliders, and that the signs of backsliding are the relinquishment of evangelical doctrine preceded by the neglect of private prayer, of watchfulness, of self-diligence, and of walking humbly with God. He quotes approvingly regarding the neglect of private prayer the saying of another that "the backsliders might draw up and read an address to the Deity, but could not pray" (p. 13). Another cause of backsliding he assigns to the falling into gross immorality, as illustrated by Peter, another cause to the love of the world and to avarice, as illustrated by Lot's vision of the Jordan plain, another to the taking of "an eager interest in religious disputes" (p. 25), adding that "the great point with Christians should be an attachment to government irrespective of party" (p. 31). The symptoms of this evil, he says, are evidenced by sinning and not repenting of the sin, denying instead of confessing our sins, or continuing in the practice of them (p. 37), the refraining from the open practice of sin for selfish considerations, the taking pleasure in talking of evil, or in dwelling upon it in our thoughts, of the trifling with temptation and putting ourselves in the way of it. The means of recovery, he states, are returning to God, . . . embracing the opportunity to read the Holy Scriptures, and especially the second chapter of Jeremiah, and certain of the Psalms, which he names, reflecting on the aggravating circumstances of our offences which render them evil, reflecting on the goodness of God, and on our past states of mind, remembering from whence we are fallen that we may repent, and that we should set apart special times for fasting and prayer. It is no wonder that

this little book was found helpful and that there was a call for its repeated publication. The need of the study and assimilation of these simple but wholesome truths is certainly as great to-day as one hundred years ago.

It is noteworthy that the term "backslider" nowhere is found in Potts' Concordance and nowhere occurs in the inspired Word of God except in the prophets. In one verse in Proverbs (xiv. 14) the word is used, but there is no attempt to prescribe for the state of mind. We read there simply that "the backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways." The sixteen prophets lived and wrote about eight hundred years B. C. In their days iniquity abounded. The wicked King Jeroboam "had sinned and made Israel to sin." The captivity of Judah and Israel followed later. In the state of national life that caused the captivity and which followed the Israelites in their captivity the prophets had abundant means of observing the effects of falling into sin and the means of escape from it. The prophets predicted future events. They were the instruments of revealing the Lord's will to men, they foretold the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ and the redemption effected by Him. "A prophet in the sense of the letter of the Word is one to whom a revelation is made, then abstractly the revelation itself; but in the internal sense he is one who teaches and also abstractly the doctrine itself" (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 2534). Because the prophet Jeremiah had seen and known in his own personal life the nature of evil, and the use that might be made of it by the man who had fallen into it, he was able to be the mouthpiece of the Lord in uttering these words: "Thine own wickedness shall correct thee, and thy backsliding shall reprove thee. Know therefore and see that it is an evil thing and a bitter that thou has forsaken the Lord thy God, and that my fear is not in thee, saith the Lord God of Hosts." (ii. 19.)

The world will sometime discover that there is no book like the Bible in its capacity to reveal the true inwardness of human nature and the workings of the finite mind and heart. When spiritually interpreted, and the light of its inner meanings are

brought out, no human writings on psychology compare with it. Take, for instance, the fourteenth chapter of the prophet Hosea and we have a perfect treatise of the cause and cure of the evil of backsliding. The first part of the chapter begins with the beseeching call to return to the Lord, with the prayer to Him "to take away all iniquity and receive us graciously," followed by the expression of thanks for the promised deliverance. Then follow the words which teach the ineffectual means of attempting to cure the evil which human nature separated from the Divine always tries. We are each tempted to use the same unavailing means to-day. We need to know what is likely to be presented as a seeming but illusory help that we may avoid relying upon it. Listen to the Divine caution against the false persuasions that would speak to us in this, our critical struggle with evil: "Asshur shall not save us; we will not ride upon horses: neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, ye are our gods; for in Thee the fatherless findeth mercy." (verse 3.)

Asshur is the same as Assyria, and stands for the same national characteristics. Assyria was a great and powerful country on the Tigris, the capital of which was Nineveh. The princes of Assyria were always looking for a chance to revolt, though they attained "a very high degree of material comfort and prosperity" (Smith's Dict. Bible), and "made tunnels, aqueducts, and drains, used the level and roller, engraved gems, and understood enamelling and overlaying with metals" (*Ibid.*). Because of this predominating intellectual or reasoning faculty the prophet Ezekiel likens the Assyrian to the cedar tree:—

Behold the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon, with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among his thick boughs, the waters made him great, the deep set him on high with her rivers running about his plants and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field. . . . All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations, . . . nor (was) any tree in

the garden of God like unto him in his beauty. . . . All the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God envied him. (xxx. 3-10.)

In days of a progressive regenerating life our capacity to reason and confirm our faith in Divine revelation rises like a mighty cedar with leafy arms outspread to catch the breezes of the upper air and delights in the rays of heavenly sunshine. "All the trees of the Eden" of the soul envy this capacity to reach up towards the Divine. But in the time of our backsliding even this exalted capacity to reason about and formulate and arrange and demonstrate the ways of Providence will not suffice. "Asshur shall not save us." The reason is not far to find now that the fact of the insufficiency of the reason is revealed to us. We have been through this reasoning process before; we have proved to ourselves before we fell away from our ideals that there was a God, that His Providence was over and around us, that His Word is Divine. The futility of arguing or reasoning with our former friends who to us seem to have deserted the church as the means of inducing them to come back into the fold is taught with equal clearness by these words that "Asshur shall not save us." Not only reasoning fails us, but the understanding which we have used to transport us from one mental state to another proves insufficient, for it is immediately added: "We will not ride upon horses." How prone we are to rely upon our wits to deliver us in spiritual as well as in natural emergencies! How helpful to know at the outset of our undertakings that to get back to the path that leads heavenward that the intellect alone is powerless to bring back the heart to God!

Abandoning the hope of an intellectual restoration to the way of salvation, how easy it is to go to the other extreme, and trust to the good that we think we have done! We survey what may appear to the world to be an outward industrious and helpful life, and are tempted to say that will save us. We hold up our hands before our eyes and upon them we think our salvation is written. Again we are self-deceived; again we hear the searching Divine words: "Neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, Ye are our gods."

Turning from the spurious hope of restoration to the heavenly life by faith alone, or by intellectual progress merely, on the one hand, and from the equally vain trust in meritorious good on the other, the soul is left alone with God, and "in Thee the fatherless findeth mercy."

The cure of the backsliding habit is effected only by the Divine love. The Word of God declares it; human experience proves it.

The familiar words, sacred beyond expression, and if possible made still more beautiful by association with the music of the chant, which we have heard so often sung from our childhood, contain the only positive and certain remedy for the backsliding habit: "I will heal their backsliding; I will love them freely; for mine anger is turned away from him."

A backslider is in the sight of the Lord as one dangerously wounded. The Lord comes to him to "heal" him,—to pour in oil and wine. A little child that has cut itself runs first not to its father, but to its mother. And what does the mother do? She does not begin by chiding the child for touching the forbidden knife, but proceeds at once to bind up its wounds. So in a way infinitely more tender does the Lord bend over us who have fallen and lie maimed and bruised by the wayside. Every soul knows or can know of the unspeakable, the unutterable sense of the love of the Lord. He bears with our persistent waywardness, with our repeated lapses, with our hard-heartedness, our sinfulness, with a patience and mercy that is altogether above our comprehension. Think of the times that we have neglected His calls to duty, of our half-hearted obedience, of our positive wrong-doings, and still He keeps on doing for us and blessing us day after day and year after year. "The love of God passeth all understanding"; it overtops the cedars of Lebanon; it outruns the horse in its swiftness to help; it supplants the human hands with the "everlasting arms." He loves us "freely"; that is, without stint or limit; without regard to our merit, for we have none in His sight. He does not wait for his love to be earned; it overflows at once, of its own accord,

upon the penitent soul. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget yet will I not forget thee." (ISA. xlix. 15.)

The revelations to the New Church unfold and apply these marvellous lessons of the Divine love taught us in the Word of the Lord. We are told that "the Lord leads man through the societies of the hells" (Ath. Creed, Apocalypse Explained, 1153); that is, if a man for the time being is not content with doing good, but will do evil, the Lord still stays with him, leading him from a milder to a still milder form of evil, until finally, if man is willing, He brings him into heaven. Can we conceive of the patience of an absolute pure and holy One dealing with gross, impure, perverted human nature? No human being could think of doing such acts of condescension.

Again we are taught "that the Lord cannot even turn His face from man or look at him with a stern countenance." (True Christian Religion, 56.)

"What the mercy of the Lord is no one can know, because it infinitely transcends the understanding of man; but what the mercy of man is, man knows, that it is to repent and to grieve" (Arcana Cœlestia, 588). "Love itself is turned into mercy, and becomes mercy when any one is regarded from love or charity and is in need of aid; hence mercy is the effect of love towards the needy and miserable" (*Ibid.*, 3063). "Divine mercy is pure mercy towards the whole human race" (Heaven and Hell, 522). Again the Lord is "love itself, to which no other attributes are fitting than those of pure love, thus of pure mercy towards the whole human race; which is such that it wishes to save all and make them happy forever, and to bestow on them all that it has; *thus out of pure mercy to draw all who are willing to follow, to heaven*, that is to itself by the strong force of love" (Arcana Cœlestia, 1735). "The Lord, from the divine love, or mercy, wishes to have all near to Himself; and so that they should not stand at the doors; that is, in the first heaven; but He wishes them to be in the third; and if it were possible, *not only with Himself, but in Himself.*" (*Ibid.*, 1799.)

Still again:—

Love such as the Lord had transcends all human understanding and is most incredible to those who do not know what the heavenly love is in which the angels are. To save a soul from hell the angels regard death as nothing, and would, if it were possible, even undergo hell. Hence it is the height of their joy to take up into heaven one who is rising from the dead. But they confess that this love is not in the least from themselves, but that the whole and every particular of it is from the Lord alone; they are even indignant if any one thinks otherwise. (*Ibid.*, 2077.)

The world about us to-day stands in need of this gospel of the infinite divine love. To go after the sinful with the Assyrian reasoning, waving the cedar of Lebanon, or while riding upon the horse of the understanding, although it be the white horse of the Revelation, or to seek wandering men by preaching the gospel of work for the hands, will not save them. Reasoning and intellectual theses and discussions have their place and their use which are not to be despised or overlooked, but the salvation of erring souls can only be accomplished by the healing power of the divine love. Those who are estranged from our religious communities are not to be left to suffer alone in the cold, nor can we hope to regain their confidence by argument or criticism. Following the divine example we can unobtrusively continue to do kindly acts in their behalf without solicitude whether they follow with us. So shall this wondrous love of the Lord be more patient and more blessed to us as we learn to be loving and patient with our fellow sinners. The consciousness of the divine presence, the sense of His infinite mercy, is the essence of salvation.

Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me. (PSALM cxxxix. 8-10.)

WARREN GODDARD.

TEACHING YOUTH AT THE CRITICAL AGE IN THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.*

LAST year in this Conference we considered, in a remarkably helpful series of addresses, the very vital question, "What shall we teach?" We all enjoyed these addresses when we heard them, and later, in a printed form, when they came before the larger New-Church audience, they doubtless made a more lasting impression. To-day we are trying to make it plain that there is a way to render the teaching of New-Church truths more effective. My own contribution is intended to be helpful in classes of boys and girls where, if there is any interest at all in the subjects under discussion, it is manifested in asking questions having little relevancy to the lesson, or such as seem to have been suggested by a very worldly if not a skeptical mind. From this circumstance the age has often been denominated the "skeptical age" and the "critical age." Of course, the public schools have this same condition to deal with, and quite generally they deal with it successfully. The Sunday-schools must learn from them to suit their instruction to the mental ability and capacity of the pupil, and to develop mental alertness and interest.

The introduction of a system of graded lessons indicates that our leaders in Sunday-school work are acting with intelligence in this matter. The child is affectionate, loves the marvellous in history and story, worships heroes, is obedient to power, and grows by imitation. The Old Testament stories, the Lord's miracles, His birth and babyhood, and His care for little children are proper food for their minds and hearts.

The subjects for the more mature children also seem to me to be well chosen, suggesting, as they do, in addition to the memo-

*A paper read at the Massachusetts Sabbath-School Conference of the New Jerusalem, held in Boston February 22, 1908.

rizing and study of the Word, simple lessons in the spiritual meaning, and from the writings of Swedenborg. We sometimes make the mistake, at this early age, of endeavoring to teach some book consecutively, with too much detail, and with the convincing logic of the author. Are we not in danger of forgetting the slow development of the reasoning faculty? After a few more years we are dealing with youth at the "critical age." Let us note its manifestations.

It is very worldly, or thinks it is, which means that it is observing closely those who are entering upon manhood and womanhood to which it is approaching, and, superficially, it is the dearest wish of its heart to enter into that more mature state and to seem thoroughly of it. But it does not know and cannot experience that maturity until the years have brought it, and therefore it puts on the semblance of it. It does things and says things that are mildly shocking, without meaning to startle; but when the effects are noted by their author, then sometimes more electricity is generated and of course discharged on occasion. To those who do not understand the peculiarities of the age, the young people get the reputation of being frivolous, worldly, and skeptical. Few deserve the title. It is my experience that nearly all prefer to prepare themselves for maturity, however devoted they seem to be to the imitations. In other words, have we not sometimes at least, met the questionings and the questions of dawning, developing rationality by sermons, by statements of doctrines, and abstract moral precepts, when it would have been almost, if not quite impossible, for the one addressed to tell you the virtues that ought to be exemplified in the simplest game played for recreation or diversion, or how one may steal without taking some material thing belonging to another, or lie without saying a word or making a sign. We must assume that from twelve to sixteen or even eighteen years there is great ignorance because of lack of experience; but if we really know what should be supplied and how to supply it, interest will not be wanting, and attention will be secured. You will understand that what I

am advocating is not to displace memorizing from the Word, study of the Bible, or of the doctrines of the church; but in addition to them, in order to make a foundation for character by illustrating and defining the virtues that enter into mature character. We cannot be virtuous if we do not know what it is to be virtuous, or even if we restrict the use of the word to a very narrow meaning. If I mistake not, the establishment of Reading Circle Classes in our Young-People's Association, indicates that a need is felt of instruction in the letter of the Word as well as in the doctrines of our faith if the present generation is to be fitted to grasp spiritual leadership in the church, when it is laid down by the fathers. I think there is abundant evidence that not only our youth, but some of our mature church members, are not well enough grounded in the Word in its letter, and I doubt sometimes whether they use it frequently in temptations as the Lord did. Do we really believe that a verse of the Word repeated with confidence when evil thoughts fill our minds and we are incited to do evil, is all-powerful to restore us to a normal condition of sanity? And do we teach from conviction to conviction that the Lord holds us always in equilibrium, but on different planes, after each yielding to temptation or resistance of it, and that we are free moral agents and can use the Lord's power to rise towards any ideals and aspirations we may cherish in our better moments?

I mean by this brief introduction to say that there is need that every pupil in the Sunday-school every Sunday shall add to his store of the letter of the Word, and shall receive some spiritual lesson suited to his intelligence. Beyond these things there should be the constant purpose on the part of the teacher to develop rational thinking and accurate utterance of thoughts, as rationality dawns.

The Lord and the Word are said to be our defense, our strong tower, our deliverer. And we are taught to shun evils as sins against God. The sins of course, are the sins of the Decalogue, lying, stealing, etc. A virtuous man or woman is one who lives the Commandments. The virtues then are elements in his

character. He would not tell you a falsehood, he would not take your goods from you without paying for them, he would not kill, commit adultery, bear false witness, nor covet. But how broad are the applications of these divine commands in our daily lives! What are our standards of measurement of our success in keeping the Commandments and possessing the virtues? We need to see that in every act of our lives whether at work or play, the virtues should have constant application and personal exemplification. We teach that the Lord is our perfect example of unselfish service, and we should do as he did. But no young person thinks of the Lord as active in the same way as they and their parents are active. There is no account of His playing games, carrying on a commercial business, or of His being employed with other workmen as a craftsman, or of His laboring in the fields, orchards, or vineyards of His native land. He was a teacher and preacher, a prophet and religious reformer, after being subject in His youth to the carpenter, Joseph, and, of course, other religious teachers find in His life a perfect example. But how little His life parallels the life of boys and girls in their recreations and at their studies, and men and women raising and supporting their families in conformity with the requirements of the very complex modern society. I think there is a real demand upon us to define and illustrate ethical concepts in connection with the distinctly religious instruction suited to years that precede maturity. Such knowledge seeming to be rather of the world than of the church will help to establish standards for measuring conduct in the world.

An incident in a recent meeting of the Boston New-Church Club seems to me to be to the point. It was stated by one of our ministers that the belief was general both in and out of the church that in these days it is not possible to succeed in business and be honest and live up to the Golden Rule. I have myself heard a New-Church business man express the same conviction. But in this meeting the minister referred to, thought it would be of very practical service if the business men present would

put us right in the matter. Two of our older and most successful business men promptly responded. They said that in business lives of more than thirty years it had never been necessary to cheat their customers and employers, so long as they were contented with reasonable profits and a reasonable price for their services. Here was an ethical standard set up which to me illuminated the whole great question of the business and labor world of to-day. We ought and may set other such ethical standards before our young people, which, being written in the language of the world, could be carried with them into the world's activities without being criticized as being too high for practical application. We have been told in a recent address to the young people that what they wanted was a chance to meet by themselves without the presence of any older person, for then they would come regularly and with deep interest to the Sunday-school; because they could ask and answer questions which they are not free to discuss in the presence of older persons. In my judgment the claim is a specious one. It is indeed true that experience is an effective teacher, but the school of experience is notoriously a severe one and it is fools that are said to learn in no other. Wise men desire to begin, if possible, where the previous generation left off, and stand upon their shoulders. If one really desires to learn, and not to dawdle, the presence of an experienced guide for the unexplored way is very important, if only to point the direction along which progress can be made. No parent was ever deceived into thinking that "playing school" was the real thing. Sometimes in both day and Sunday-schools, from necessity, a class is left to itself for a time; but we all understand that the session will be a profitable one to the extent only that a leader develops among the pupils.

I want to suggest for your consideration that ethical questions have an important place in the teaching of youth at the "critical age," but most certainly not by the lecture method, or in the abstract. What the young people want, to develop and hold their interest in the church, is to know the bearing of religion upon every activity of any day's life, as well its playtimes, its periods of rest and refreshment, as its hours of labor.

The New Church teaches clearly that the elements of character are the results of deliberate choices. I desire at the outset to bring out the fact that we are making and must make many such choices every day. A first question may be, "What are the virtues needed to play well a game like tennis, or baseball, or cards?" A quick answer may be, that no virtues are involved, or that quickness is the most important virtue needed. You ask about the particulars of the last afternoon or evening devoted to play. Were there any unpleasant incidents? You are pleased if there were none, and you proceed to ask of other occasions and other games. It is sure to come out that on such another occasion some one cheated, at another time some one told a falsehood, or became angry, or used improper language, or rehearsed unpleasant gossip about friends, or was boastful, or said or did other things that showed little present regard for the virtues. Would not such acts, when at recreation, confirm one, in his hours of work, in the same disregard of the obligation of virtuous living? Undoubtedly they would. There can be little dissent from the conclusion. Then the old heathen Greek was right when he refused to tell a lie even in jest. Then it is evident that in our recreations the good sought is not to be realized in its highest degree if the homely virtues are not practised. Is it likely that our young people would develop this fact except under skilled guidance? Having acted as guide in showing that equally in play as in work, to do a thing up to the mark requires the characteristics of a saint and a hero, we should pass on to show why we are bound to practise these virtues. This is the question of moral responsibility.

The Christian Church has taught, at least in one of its powerful branches,—and I understand Swedenborg to tell us that the first Christian Church before its consummation was almost a unit in teaching essentially the same doctrine,—that entrance into heaven should be the aim of every human soul, and that the church has the key to this entrance. It can open the door to whom it will, and keep it closed against whom it will. No doubt millions have believed this claim to be valid, and have

paid the price demanded for admission in coin of a worldly sort. It is said that a very comfortable feeling results from meeting the demands of the church in this particular. Huxley has expressed a similar thought, and his own conclusions, if only he could have a strong faith; but his rational faculties were opposed, and he felt obliged to act accordingly. He said that if he could always think what is true and do what is right, even if it were on condition of being turned into a sort of clock to be wound up every morning, he would at once close with the offer. Young people are always ready to consider such a question as Huxley suggests, but they never agree with his conclusions. They are sure that with manhood and womanhood must go responsibility, even if accompanied by experiences of sin, suffering, and hard labor. Here is to be enforced the doctrine of our church, the effects of wrong choices in making us less manly, and of wise choices in establishing us upon higher planes of living. That it is really a plane of living giving more real enjoyment may be enforced by calling attention to the physiological fact that the organs of the body without exception when in health perform their functions with a real satisfaction and pleasure to the individual.

We should not leave the question of responsibility until we have considered its application to our blunders, our forgetfulness, our acts when angry, and to acts of those under the influence of stimulants and narcotics, or under the stress of hunger and want. We should understand that all these subjects are brought before the class by concrete examples, but never by name. We should not lead our pupils to cause the hatred or condemnation of a person, but always consider the concrete act as it appears to us. It will take many lessons to establish the facts of the close connection of moral questions with our various activities, and that we are continuously responsible for our choices. But having made this clear, we are prepared to define the virtues and to consider them separately.

We might begin to define the characteristics of goodness by a question like this: Have you an acquaintance with no pur-

pose in life? Describe a day in the life of such a person as you can imagine it from what facts you have. What is the difference between such a day and that of one who has a definite aim? The particulars in the two lives will, of course, come to represent a composite in which an ideal is presented and its antipathy. The sluggish unhappiness of the one will be contrasted with the eager activity of the other.

Then the class may be asked to make a list of things that are good for nothing, and report at some other period. The total of the lists may be very large and various, comprising, perhaps, insect pests, weeds, a buttonhole not used, the paring of a finger nail, or a hair that has come out. But possible use may be found for each of these, and these not more improbable than the uses made in manufacturing establishments of what were only waste products but a few years ago.

All these things are then good, and we define goodness as fitted for service. But we notice a striking difference between the results of the service rendered by things and by man. Questions such as these may bring this out. "You have a good hat, a good pencil, a good knife, and you use them. What is the effect on these things of this use?" It is easily answered. "They wear out." Do animals and does man also wear out from service? The conclusion is that the physical part does and needs to be renewed again and again by taking proper nourishment and rest. But some will quickly see that the mind, the spiritual man, does not, but on the contrary grows stronger from use. At the proper time we shall need to show this is only apparently so, and that truth is the proper food for sustenance of the spiritual man, and that the great storehouse for this food is the Word of God.

Now we can state the fact more fully. Finite things, however perfectly fitted for use, wear out by using. Man both as a physical and spiritual being is almost helpless at birth, but has infinite possibilities of growth for higher and higher uses, as he shuns evils as sins against God and makes wise choices. Another contrast,—material things which we desire to hand down

to future generations, we keep in cases, as much as possible away from the corroding influences of sun and air and other contact. To develop in a child a manhood that shall inspire generations of men, we show that service is the highest type of manhood, and we give encouragement to find everywhere in the world, and very near at hand, too, opportunities to exercise the virtue and to grow therefrom.

Another subject in which there is need of clarifying the mind is rendering fair judgments. The Lord said, "Judge not that ye be not judged." This may seem to mean that we should not judge at all if we would ourselves escape condemnation. But we cannot help judging. We confirm our characters in this way. What we should avoid is hasty judgments, and particularly when directed against our fellows.

We may enter upon the consideration of this subject by citing the deeds of men recorded in ancient history, or by taking up the habits and customs of people foreign to our own, or some every-day problems. Why was Abraham commended for preparing to sacrifice Isaac, while poor Mr. Freeman, of Cataumet, who, in imitation of Abraham, actually sacrificed his daughter, was judged a lunatic? Each thought he was carrying out the command of God. Was it right for the Puritans to banish Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams? Was it right for George Washington to hold slaves? Is it right to keep a saloon for the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage? Is it a worthy ambition in Commander Peary to discover the North Pole? Is a mother justified in forbidding her daughter to dance? Or a father in forbidding his son to go swimming or to play football?

Under guidance the discussion of questions like these may be made very helpful in leading us to put ourselves in the place of the person whose deeds are being discussed, after reproducing his environment of age, education, civilization, and other circumstances. We must consider whether the observed blindness to principles in force generally to-day in civilized countries comes from defective vision, or a refusal to see. If the latter,

we can hardly expect that responsibility will be avoided. If the former, we will remember that the Lord distinctly said that some things were allowed even to His chosen people, and men after His own heart, because of the hardness of their hearts. Charity is certainly promoted by being careful to render fair judgments. It is related of one of our New-Church fathers of a former generation that he was so careful not to render an unfair judgment, that when cases of very unworthy conduct were brought to his attention, although he seemed deeply moved by them, his only remark was, "They were certainly not orderly, if the reporter was correct in his observations."

We want our class to distinguish between sin and disastrous error, to learn what conscience is and how much of a guide it may become. Again, as always, we bring out the facts by concrete examples. A night switchman has had sickness in his family, has lost much sleep and rest, and falls asleep while on duty in the tower, and a train is wrecked with many near and remote results of sorrow and pain and material loss. Did the switchman sin? I once saw a hungry man, on a cold day, slip inside of the door of a bakeshop and make off with some food from a loaded counter. Did he sin? Did I sin in not trying to apprehend the man and recover the property? A boy walks past my orchard, where there are many apples both on the ground and on the tree. He takes an apple from the ground and goes along eating it. Did he steal? Would it have been more punishable if he had broken the apple from the tree? Was it a sin? Would the fact that the boy knew me make any difference in your judgment of the act? Suppose it had been a girl or a woman. I want the class to confirm the conclusion of the doctrine of the New Church. A sin is an act that establishes our character on a more selfish basis. What is conscience? Is it an infallible guide? Did the apostle Paul, before his conversion, sin in persecuting the Christians? Was he equally conscientious at that time and afterwards when preaching the gospel and suffering persecution? What was the difference in his conscience? The Puritans persecuted the

Quakers and the so-called witches. Did they follow their consciences in doing so, as they said they did? Did they sin? We want to bring out the fact that it is only when we are open to the influences from heaven and the Lord, and to the extent that we are so open, that we have a conscience. To act from selfishness, to promote selfishness, to gain position, power, influence, or ease and freedom from annoyance is not to act from conscience.

Right here would be an opportunity to consider the place and binding force of statute laws not obviously founded upon the prohibitions of the Decalogue. You are forbidden by city ordinance to slide on a certain street. You do slide there and you observe no harm done to other people. Was it wrong? Was it a sin? You know the rates for postage. You wrap a letter up in a paper and put on the postage for the paper and slip it into the mail box. You smuggle some dutiable goods from Canada or from Europe. Is it on your part a question affecting morals? Remember that it is not the purpose of the teacher to enter too deeply into the questions of right and wrong involved, as he sees it from his greater experience, but to draw out from the class such distinctions as they can and do understand. He is trying to establish mental and moral alertness, and the habit of looking to the Lord for help and guidance in all he is doing.

We are taught that man was created and placed in his environment on the earth because the Lord, who is love itself, desired to have rational beings to love and serve and such as could learn to find their happiness in loving Him and serving Him. It is not strange, then, that man is at his best when serving the objects of his love. It is more blessed to give than to receive. We want to teach our young people the positiveness of life. Such questions as these may lead up to the thought we wish conveyed. What do you want most? What would you do to get it? What would you do with it after you get it? Can you be good if you do not want anything? Is it better to have a strong interest, say, in playing some game, or a weak

interest in going to school? Does hard work lessen the interest in the thing being done? In Longfellow's poem of Lady Wentworth, what changed Martha, the scrub-girl, into the efficient housekeeper and later into the mistress of the Hall? Such questions should bring out the fact that it is not outside pressure, but inside devotion that promotes virtuous conduct. Sacrifice and drudgery lose their meaning when illuminated by a worthy end sought. Children often have no other idea of selfishness than doing what one wishes to do, and of unselfishness as doing what one dislikes to do. They should be taught rather that it is the motive that determines. The same outward act may be selfish or unselfish, even when done by the same person. A little child gives all his pennies to a ragged woman he sees. It may be an unselfish act, but more likely it is done from mixed motives. The same may be true of the pennies of the Sunday-school contribution. I love my father and my mother better than myself, I say. Is it always unselfish to give up my pleasure to theirs? Can we decide from specific acts that the actor is selfish or the reverse? By numerous examples lead up to the truth that unselfishness is rather an attitude of sympathy that leads us to look to the ultimate good of our neighbor. What is it to be courageous? We all aspire to be heroes, and we dread being so placed that we may "show the white feather." Once a youth was annoying his little sister, because she had been afraid of something before which he thought himself very brave. The mother quietly observed that the little girl did not lack moral courage. The grown man to-day has no desire to compare his courage with that of the little girl now a woman. Fearlessness is often counted as courage, as is also calmness in cases where some see immanent danger. In each case the conduct may be called forth by ignorance or perfect knowledge. The essence of courage consists in facing a real danger, the magnitude of which is unknown, and controlling one's fear. There were real lions in the path that Christian must tread.

The opportunities for exemplification of true courage in daily life should be dwelt upon, and particularly in trying to live up

to an ideal we have formed without ostentation. Daniel, after the edict of the king, as before, at the same hour, in the same room, and with his window opened towards Jerusalem, made his usual prayers.

Be very careful not to foster the "holier-than-thou" spirit of the Pharisee. Some young people like to pose as martyrs.

Perhaps I have now said enough to show how wide is the field of subjects that may be brought up in classes of young people in connection with the distinct lessons from the Word and the doctrines that are the usual subjects for study. I am convinced that such instruction should be given. Through it we should hope that the names of the virtues should bring up true concepts of the things themselves, and that these may be seen to be the foundations of the best in manly and womanly character.

WALTER A. ROBINSON.

THE POETRY OF COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE.

THERE are, in general, two ways in which the subject of marriage may be treated: first, marriage as a beautiful ideal; second, marriage as we commonly know it. The one is the poetry; the other the prose of marriage.

Marriage as we know it is never entirely ideal. Too often it is quite the reverse. The subject is now surrounded by many influences and suggestions calculated to degrade our conception of it. For this reason it is of utmost importance that people, especially young people, should have in their hearts a pure and ennobling ideal of the sex-relation. And therefore we are now to consider the poetry of the subject. We shall see that some poets, at least, have enshrined for us, in terms of imperishable beauty, as something essentially sweet, chaste, holy, and heavenly, an exalted conception of marriage.

In the second part of Goethe's "Faust," the poet lays much stress upon the influence of art, as one of the factors in Faust's spiritual exaltation, and we are now to note the heavenly origin which the poet ascribes to the beautiful in art, and also the mystical significance which he attaches to the idea of sex as something transcending earth, space and time.

In the old Faust legend one of the demands made by its hero upon the devil in fulfilment of their compact, was that he should bring back from Hades, and present to him as his paramour, the Trojan Helen, celebrated in Homer's "Iliad," as one of the most beautiful women in history. In Goethe's hands, the episode is transfigured. Helena becomes the embodiment of the idea of the Beautiful in Art, and it becomes the function of Mephistopheles, as the representative of the evil power associated with the self-intelligence and sensual faculties of Faust, to help him to the attainment of the Beautiful.

The idea is brought out in a mysterious scene, which has

given much puzzlement to Goethe's critics. In meeting Faust's demand Mephistopheles declares:*

In solitude are throned the Goddesses,
No space around them, place and time still less;
Only to speak of them embarrasses;
They are THE MOTHERS!

Something in the weird suggestion of the word terrifies Faust as he repeats it:—

Faust. Mothers!
Mephistopheles. Hast thou dread?
Faust. The Mothers! Mothers!—a strange word is said.
Mephistopheles. It is so. Goddesses unknown to ye,
The Mortals,—named by us unwillingly.
Delve in the deepest depths must thou to reach them.

When Faust asks the way to the Mothers, Mephistopheles replies:—

No way! To the Unreachable
Ne'er to be trodden! A way to the Unbeseechable,
Never to be besought! Art thou prepared?
There are no locks, no latches, to be lifted;
Through endless solitudes shalt thou be drifted.

To Mephistopheles, the spirit of negation, the man who knows the Supreme Ideas in his intellect, but who denies them in his heart, the Mothers dwell in a Void. But to Faust, the spirit who ceaselessly aspires, and who affirms the supremely good and true and beautiful, there is a different conception:—

I to the Void am sent,
That Art and Power therein, I may augment:
Come on, then! We'll explore, whate'er befall;
In this thy Nothing, may I find my All!

Mephistopheles then gives Faust a key, by means of which he is to open the way to the Mothers, in whom are the sources

* Bayard Taylor's Translation, Part II, Act I, Scene 5.

of the Beautiful. There he will find a blazing tripod, or three-legged altar, which he is to bring back with him by touching it with the key, and out of the incense mist of the tripod, he will be able to evoke the form of Helena, or what forms of beauty he will.

The key! the tripod! the Mothers! symbols, of course! What do they mean? Goethe himself deigned no explanation: His critics though making guesses in the right direction, none of them seems to have hit the mark. But to the student of Swedenborg who has comprehended how deeply his teachings penetrated the mind of the great German, it seems quite plain that the "key" of the allegory, is the New-Church doctrine of "Correspondence," the parallel between material and spiritual things, according to which all natural objects and experiences are but the outward symbols and effects of that inner world where lie the spiritual life and destiny of men. This is, indeed, the key, by means of which alone we may unlock those celestial meanings, those elements of supernal truth and beauty which pervade this lower creation. Or we may take the key as the symbol of the poet's own intuition of those hidden forces and meanings.

In the tripod we have the suggestion of the spiritual possibilities of the poet, revealed to his own consciousness by means of this key. The tripod suggests the Trinity: Love, Wisdom, and Use, or Creative Activity,—the trinity as it exists in God;—as it exists in the poet: his artistic feeling or sensibility; his artistic intelligence; and his art itself in its creative activity. The incense smoke of the tripod, out of which the artist is to evoke his forms of beauty, is plainly the worship of God, for in Goethe's view all true art is but an expression of such worship.

But who were the mysterious Mothers? We have hints of them in other portions of the drama. In his first monologue Faust addresses "the sign of the Macrocosm," the term under which Goethe disguises the New-Church doctrine of the Grand Man:* the spirit of God pervading the universal Heavens, and

* See "Swedenborg in Goethe's Faust," by Emanuel F. Goerwitz, in the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW for April, 1902.

organizing them as one man before God; in which are the springs of all that is Good and Beautiful and True in this earthly existence. The yearning for fuller intercourse with these everlasting fountains of Life, is the absorbing passion of Faust's nature:—

Where you, ye breasts? Founts of all Being, shining,
Whereon hang Heaven's and Earth's desire,
Whereto our withered hearts aspire,—
Ye flow, ye feed; and am I vainly pining?

(PART I, ACT I, SCENE I.)

The Heavens! the nourishing founts of all lower forms of life, the now invisible sources of true Art! the Maternal Breasts! Why does the poet ascribe the feminine gender to the celestial regions? It was a thought of the greatest prominence in his mind for it serves as the climax of the drama. In the wonderful mystic chorus at the close, sung by the angels while Margaret is leading the soul of Faust into the higher regions of heaven, the last words are:—

The Woman-Soul leadeth us
Upward and on!

What woman? Why, who but the "Woman clothed with the sun" of the book of Revelation! The church of God! The church as embodied in the universal life of Heaven! The Bride, the Lamb's wife! What other woman-soul can it be that leads us upward and on? The celestial church in its relation to God is as a wife to a husband. It is a relation precisely analogous to that of any wife and husband, and here we have the supreme type and origin of marriage. The Creative Life flows out of the bosom of the Divine Love as Husband. It is received in the Body of the Universal Heavens,—the Grand Man as Swedenborg calls it, or the Grand Woman as Goethe prefers to think of it (the two terms but describe two aspects of the same fact),—and out of that conjunction and conception is the origin of all our visible creation, of all the goods and truths and joys that now enter into our experience.

And these are Goethe's "Mothers" —the angelic societies that penetrate our life here as Soul in Body, which serve as a Womb for the reception of the Divine Life, and out of which our own life and art are begotten.

Marriage then is organic in the structure of creation. This necessity of Love, the most intimate and perfect conjunction, in God's relation to the whole of His Humanity, is but reflected in the relation of the individual man and woman.

The sex-distinction is ineradicable from our humanity. Human beings whether in heaven or on earth, are inconceivable except along this line of division. It is primarily spiritual in its nature. That is, marriage is fundamentally of the spirit and only incidentally of the flesh. There are two elements which enter into our souls and include all their possible experience. They are, as one of our poets will presently express it for us, "the poles on which the heavenly spheres revolve." One is the intellectual activity, the other is the affectional or the emotional. In the perfect union of His Love and Wisdom, these qualities are united in God, and that is why His nature is in perfect equilibrium or rest; but they are divided as received in our created life, and are ever hungering and restlessly seeking for union with each other. Each needs the support, guidance, inspiration, and life of the other. The division is along the line of sex. The intellectual prerogative is masculine. The affectional is feminine. This is not to say that men are all head and no heart, and women all heart and no head. According to the New-Church writings, the masculine is love, covered or veiled by wisdom; the female is the wisdom of the male covered by the love thence, the wife being love surrounding, protecting and cherishing the wisdom of the husband. Thus that which outwardly shapes and colors the masculine nature, is its intellectual quality; that which outwardly moulds, softens, sweetens, and beautifies the feminine is the affectional. (See *Conjugal Love*, Nos. 32 and 33). The preponderance on one side or the other is normally according to sex, and in the mutual gravitation of these two sides, the effort to find the perfect balance each in the other, is the basic cause of sex-

attraction. The physical natures and needs of men and women as such, are but the external symbol and manifestation of that spiritual relation.

In their perfect union, the one man with the one woman who are, or become, most perfectly adapted to each other, so that they merge into one soul in God's sight, is the center in which His life mingles with that of His children. It is the nucleus of the supremest joy that human beings can know. Marriage is in fact but a name for heaven. It can never be perfectly realized short of heaven. Being a union of souls the material bodies are a bar to its perfect consummation. It is only in the spiritual world that men and women shall clearly know each other, for there alone their real characters are brought to view. The perfect marriage is impossible between imperfect characters. It is impossible amid the conditions attaching to our perishable clay. Marriage on earth is a schooling, the best possible schooling, for marriage, by means of which we become purged of our selfish and sinful elements, and grow into the stature of angelhood. But marriage as a perfect ideal, presupposes for its achievement a life that survives the grave.

Coventry Patmore was another poet whose mind is known to have been profoundly imbued with the teachings of Swedenborg, and in his lovely poem, "The Angel of the House," which is the only long poem extant devoted entirely to the subject of courtship and marriage, we have unmistakable evidence of that influence:—

This little germ of nuptial love,
Which springs so simply from the sod,
The root is, as my song shall prove,
Of all our love to man and God.

(BETROTHAL, CH. VI, ACC. II.)

Our lifted lives at last should touch
That lofty goal to which they move;
Until we find, as darkness rolls
Far off, and fleshly mists dissolve,
That nuptial contrasts are the poles
On which the Heavenly spheres revolve.

(BETROTHAL, CH. II, ACC. I.)

And this:—

Female and male God made the man;
His Image is the whole, not half.
And in our love, we dimly scan
The love which is between Himself.

(BETROTHAL, CH. IX, ACC. III.)

That is, our human marriage images the marriage of the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom in God.

But we must not keep the subject on the metaphysical plane. The sweet human love of man and maiden comes nearer home to us, and this too is pure and holy, for in these blissful days of courtship they have the foregleams and foretastes of that far off goal toward which their lives are making. Where will you find a sweeter picture of the pure love of a man for a woman than in these lines from "The Angel of the House"?

By pale and park
I rode, and ever seemed to see
In the transparent starry dark
That splendid brow of chastity,
That soft and yet subduing light,
At which, as at the sudden moon,
I held my breath and thought "how bright!"
That guileless beauty in its noon
Compelling tribute of desires,
Ardent as day when Sirius reigns,
Pure as the permeating fires,
That smoulder in the opal's veins.

(ESPOUSALS, IDYL III, SEC. 4.)

Man needs woman and is ever pursuing his ideal in woman:—

We who are married, let us own
A bachelor's chief thought in life
Is, or the fool's not worth a groan,
To win a woman for his wife.

(BETROTHAL, IDYL II, SEC. 4.)

When ripened time and chastened will
 Have stretched and tuned for love's accords
 The five-stringed lyre of life, until
 It vibrates with a wind of words;
 And "Woman," "Lady," "She," and "Her,"
 Are names for perfect Good and Fair,
 And unknown maidens talked of, stir
 His thoughts with reverential care;
 He meets by heavenly chance express,
 His destined wife: some hidden hand
 Unveils to him the loveliness
 Which others cannot understand.
 No songs of love, no summer dreams,
 Did e'er his longing fancy fire
 With vision like to this; she seems
 In all things better than desire.

(BETROTHAL, CH. III, ACC. I.)

And of the maiden's love for the man we have this charming description:—

She's told that maidens are by youths
 Extremely honoured and desired:
 And sighs: "If those sweet tales be truths,
 What bliss to be so much admired!"
 The suitors come; she sees them grieve.
 Her coldness fills them with despair;
 She'd pity if she could believe:
 She's sorry that she cannot care.

Who's this that meets her on her way?
 Comes he as enemy or friend,
 Or both? Her bosom seems to say
 He cannot pass, and there an end.

Ah whither shall a maiden flee,
 When a bold youth so swift pursues,
 And siege of tenderest courtesy,
 With hope perseverant, still renews!
 Why fly so fast? Her flattered breast

Thanks him who finds her fair and good;
 She loves her fears; veil'd joys arrest
 The foolish terrors of her blood:
 By secret, sweet degrees, her heart,
 Vanquished, takes warmth from his desire:
 She makes it more with bashful art,
 And fuels love's late dreaded fire.

(BETROTHAL, CH. XII, ACC. I.)

No man has written on this subject in nobler terms than Alfred Tennyson, and in these familiar lines from "The Princess," we have a beautiful treatment of the sex-relation, and a statement of the loftiest possibilities of the earthly marriage:—

For woman is not undevelop'd man,
 But diverse: could we make her as the man
 Sweet love were slain: his dearest bond is this,
 Not like to like, but like in difference.
 Yet in the long years liker must they grow;
 The man be more of woman, she of man;
 He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
 Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
 She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
 Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind;
 Till at the last she set herself to man,
 Like perfect music unto noble words.

.

Then comes the statelier Eden back to men:
 Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm.

.

Either sex alone
 Is half itself; and in true marriage lies
 Nor equal, nor unequal; each fulfills
 Defect in each, and always thought in thought,
 Purpose in purpose, will in will, they grow,
 The single pure and perfect animal,
 The two-cell'd heart beating with one full stroke,
 Life.

.

My bride,
 My wife, my life. O we will walk this world,
 Yoked in all exercise of noble end,
 And so thro' those dark gates across the wild
 That no man knows. Indeed I love thee; come,
 Yield thyself up; my hopes and thine are one:
 Accomplish thou my manhood and thyself;
 Lay thy sweet hands in mine and trust to me.

(CH. VII.)

Of marriage as an institution surviving the earth and the flesh, we have a striking passage in the poetry of Robert Browning, and no student of Swedenborg can read it without feeling sure that here, too, was a poet whose mind was saturated with our beautiful New-Church conception of the subject.

The passage is the conclusion of the section of "The Ring and the Book," in which the poor, abused Pompilia, the loveliest of Browning's women, who has been betrayed into a horrible farce of marriage, confesses her love for the noble priest, Caponsacchi:—

He is a priest;
 He cannot marry therefore, which is right:
 I think he would not marry if he could.
 Marriage on earth seems such a counterfeit,
 Mere imitation of the inimitable:
 In heaven we have the real, and true and sure.
 'Tis there they neither marry nor are given
 In marriage, but are as the angels; right,
 O, how right that is, how like Jesus Christ.
 To say that! Marriage-making for the Earth,
 With gold so much,—birth, power, repute so much,
 Or beauty, youth so much, in lack of these!
 But as the angels rather, who, apart,
 Know themselves into one, are found at length
 Married, but marry never, no, nor given
 In marriage; they are man and wife at once
 When the true time is.

(POMPILIA, l. 1821-37.)

Long ago, in a little village nestling in the meadowy uplands of Galilee, there was a marriage of a man and a woman. What

their names were we do not know, nor with five or six exceptions, the names of the guests. They must have been, for the most part, lowly people. Yet when all the other marriages whether of emperors and empresses of the mighty past, have slid into oblivion, that marriage will live in the minds of men, because of the simple fact that from the neighboring town of Nazareth, a humble, and at the time obscure, artizan was there.

It is a wonderful and beautiful fact of which we can never exhaust the significance that the Divine Saviour of men, He who came that we might have life, and have it more abundantly, began His public ministry, and performed His first miracle at a marriage. And that the miracle consisted in this, that when the wine of the marriage-feast gave out, He used His Divine power to renew, in a supernatural way, the supply of wine.

It was the type of all His other miracles, the expressive symbol of the work which He came on earth to accomplish. For the wine is the sacred emblem of the exhilarating joy of life.

The romance and ecstasy of courtship and the honeymoon will not endure. The old wine will fail. But if Jesus is there in the hearts of the mated couple, the wine will be renewed. The beauty and the joy of the wedded flesh will fail, only to give place to the deeper joy of the spirit, and always the new wine is better than the old.

Short of heaven we shall not know all the joy of the new wine. For marriage on earth is but the perishing bud of which we shall only know the exquisite flower and fruit in that world of the immortal spirit, where no one ever grows old, and nothing ever grows stale; where the wine of joy is never exhausted, and where everything, every instant of time, is being created new, fresh pulsing from the bosom of God.

Summing up: man and woman were made by God for each other. Each is incomplete without the other. Each needs the other and in the breast of every normal youth and maid there is the insatiable, though perhaps unconscious, hunger and seeking for the mate of the soul's vision until that mate be found. It is the relation in which all the poetry of life, its ro-

mance and all its pure joys centre. It is essentially of one man and one woman. It is not of the perishing body, but of the immortal spirit. It is of God and it is eternal. It is the very focus of the heavenly life, the reservoir into which all its ecstasies merge, and out of which all its uses flow. In the Bible marriage is the synonym of heaven. It is possible in its ideal form only to the regenerate. It is marred by irreligion and worldliness. It is befouled by impurity of body, or wantonness of mind. It is destroyed by selfishness.

The fact that very few earthly marriages seem to realize this ideal does not lessen the importance of the ideal. Nor does it alter the other fact that marriage as we know it, all imperfect though it be, is a sacred institution, ordained by God as the symbol of, and preparation for, the eternal marriage. It is, therefore, inviolable, dissoluble only by death, save at the grave peril of the parties to it, and to the injury of society,—and so deserving to be protected by all the force of public opinion and all the power of the law.

In conclusion I will quote again from Alfred Tennyson. In the following passage he makes King Arthur, his beau-ideal of chivalric manhood, speak to us out of the wreck and misery of marriage. But the very gloom of this misery serves as a background on which the ideal purity and beauty of sex-love stand out in holier lustre, and out of it there looms the sublime hope and happiness of love. The sinful Queen Guinevere has fled to hide her shame in the solemn cloisters of a nunnery. And the King before going into the last great battle which he knows will result in his death, follows her there, and standing over her form grovelling at his feet, tells her of the breaking down through her, of his plans and hopes in the organization of—

. . . that fair order of my Table-Round,
A glorious company, the flower of men,
To serve as model for the mighty world,
And be the fair beginning of a time.
I made them lay their hands in mine and swear

To reverence the King, as if he were
 Their conscience, and their conscience as their King,
 To break the heathen and uphold the Christ,
 To ride abroad redressing human wrongs,
 To speak no slander, no, nor listen to it.
 To honor his own word as if his God's,
 To lead sweet lives in purest chastity,
 To love one maiden only, cleave to her,
 And worship her by years of noble deeds,
 Until they won her; for indeed I knew
 Of no more subtle master under heaven
 Than is the maiden passion for a maid,
 Not only to keep down the base in man,
 But teach high thought, and amiable words,
 And courtliness, and the desire of fame,
 And love of truth, and all that makes a man.
 And all this throve before I wedded thee.

.
 Then came thy shameful sin with Lancelot;
 Then came the sin of Tristram and Isolt;
 Then others, following these my mightiest knights,
 And drawing foul enample from fair names
 Sinned also, till the loathsome opposite
 Of all my heart had destined did obtain,
 And all thro' thee!

.
 Mine own flesh
 Here looking down on thine polluted, cries
 "I loathe thee:" yet not less, O Guinevere,
 For I was ever virgin, save for thee,
 My love thro' flesh hath wrought into my life
 So far, that my doom is, I love thee still.

.
 Perchance, and so thou purify thy soul,
 And so thou lean on our fair father, Christ,
 Hereafter in that world where all are pure
 We too may meet before high God, and thou
 Wilt spring to me, and claim me thine, and know
 I am thy husband.

(IDYLLS OF THE KING: GUINEVERE.)

ARTHUR MERCER.

MENTAL HEALING: ITS PRACTICAL SIDE.*

MENTAL healing may mean either the healing of physical disease by mental means—the usual interpretation of it—or the healing of purely mental troubles.

Let us consider these in turn.

I. That the mind has an influence over the body certainly cannot be doubted for one moment by any New-churchman. We therefore admit this fact at once without argument. But that this influence is of such a sort and degree that it can cause and can cure bodily disease is another and much mooted question.

To help to solve this problem let us bring to our aid the doctrines of the New Church which throw light upon it, and the facts of medical science as gathered from actual experience.

The first doctrine to consider is that which declares the Lord to be Life Itself and Being Itself. He is not simply Infinite Mind, and we a part of that mind, but He is the one and only Life, and we but recipients of life. From Him flows this infinite stream of life which, coming down through the heavens, first enters that part of man's being which lies above his consciousness, the high and holy place with him. From thence it comes down into his conscious will and thought, and through them down into his body. Now if man had but this one influx into his body, and that all came in through his soul and conscious mind, then we could draw our picture about like this,

* It was voted at the meeting of the Massachusetts Association of the New Jerusalem Church, held in Brockton, October, 1907, that the subject, "Mental Healing," be continued to the April meeting. So this paper, being a continuation of the others, does not attempt to go over the whole subject, or cover the same ground again, or to enter exhaustively into those finer details of doctrine respecting which there is some difference of opinion in the church. But its aim is to bring out what may be called the practical side of the theme, with the hope that it may prove helpful to the average and enquiring New-Church believer.

and say, if all the channels of his being were opened up to the free and unimpeded inflow of this divine life into him he would experience good thoughts and happy feelings in his higher parts, and as that same life coursed down and through his body it would bring ease, comfort, and health there. But if that divine life were impeded anywhere, or, in passing through the mind, it met and encountered evil thought and purpose there, then it would be deflected, and as it came down into the physical parts it would produce the opposite of health which is ill-health and the opposite of ease which is *dis*-ease,—an absence of ease. In other words, if the mind were harboring wrong above, then the divine life coming through that wrong, would cast a shadow as it were upon the body. The mental wrong would make its imprint upon the physical parts. The mind state would become the body state. And before there could be any disease of the body, it could be claimed, there must first be this diseased mental condition,—this wrong thinking and feeling.

Now this does not seem to me to be quite true, because, as already hinted, it assumes that all influx into the body comes in through the mind, which is a wrong premise to start with, as will be shown later, and because it makes no distinction between the conscious thinking mind and that which lies unconscious.

As a matter of fact, every man has hereditary tendencies to evil which are not in his conscious mind at all. Strictly speaking, they are not his, nor any part of him, till by freest volition he makes them so. And this one fact of his having evils in him which he cannot get at, which he is not even aware of, and so can have no possible control over, is alone sufficient to spoil, at one stroke, the whole theory of mental healing by right thinking.

But this is not all. If it is a fact that every disease depends upon some mental wrong which can be put away, then there must be some ratio between a man's bodily health and his spiritual character, which is not true. As a matter of fact, the pugilists and prize fighters are probably the strongest and healthiest men physically that the country knows, and at the

same time they are not infrequently the lowest lived men. And if conscious mental evil is the cause of physical disease, what shall we say of those little tender, new-born babes who have never thought or imagined a wrong? Fresh from their Maker's hands they seem to be the very crystal window through which we may look up to the heavenly Father and his angels. Into their soft interiors steal the sweetest sensations, the purest and holiest emotions. They seem to lie so near to their heavenly Father's bosom as to be conscious of nothing but just the throbbings of His love. And yet! let the germ of diphtheria or any other disease enter, and those little ones, as pure in thought and purpose as the very sunlight of heaven,—those little ones, surrounded and infilled with the presence of the highest angels who always behold the Father's face,—those little ones sicken and weaken, and pass on to the care of other, higher, and tenderer hands than ours. Has their beautiful state of mind fortified them against the disease? Not one whit. For there is no age when disease makes such terrible and fatal inroads into the flesh as in these young and tender hours of infancy.

Again it is said that the entrance of certain evils into the mind, such as envy and jealousy, will close many cells in the body. Well! What of it? A cool draught, a laugh or sneeze, will open and close ten thousand such cells. "Toxins are found in the blood after indulging hatred." They are also there every time we have a headache from indigestion, or breathing foul air. In fact, they are there much of the time with all of us. The popular notion that fear may cause disease or may render one more liable to contract it, has, in my judgment very little, if any, foundation in fact. I know of over one hundred patients who have distinctly dreaded certain diseases from eight to fourteen years, but not one of them has had the dreaded disease. For fourteen years one man has been coming about once a month for me to examine him, as he is sure he has a malignant growth. He says he has lived in terror of it for the last thirty years, and yet there is no sign of it, or any other disease, in his system. I do not know how long fear has to work to bring results, but

thirty years seems long enough. If the mental process of curing a disease is as slow and tedious as that of causing it, the most of us will not need its help.

Fright, perhaps, may cause disease, but I am constrained to believe that it is rather a coincidence than an actual cause of the disease. At all events, I have seen many automobile and electric car accidents, burning buildings, steam railway wrecks, where cars were telescoped and people killed and frightened beyond description. I have even been on the very scene where a four-story factory full of people was blown up by an exploding boiler which went up like a rocket through the building, causing the most appalling scenes, and yet with a committee watching for four years the results, I have not been able to find so much as one instance of disease resulting therefrom. And if fright were any considerable cause of disease it would seem as if it would show itself quite extensively among these two or three thousand frightened people. At all events, these are matters of such trifling account as to be wholly inconsequential. And others there are which are founded only on the merest paucity of facts. Still underlying all these there yet remains the honest, sober fact that the mind does have an influence over the body. And that fact is so self-evident that we admitted it at the outset without argument. And also we admit that evil states of mind produce deranged conditions of the body. But our distinctive point is that it is not necessarily evil which produces these deranged bodily conditions. Good states of mind will often do the same. It is certainly true that troublesome thoughts of business, or of the household, will keep people awake at night; but a pleasant entertainment or a happy birthday party is oftentimes even more potent to disturb sleep. Anger reddens the face. True! But a maiden's pure love will paint the cheek quite as scarlet a hue.

But hatred, it is argued, is so powerful that if one should hate intensely for an hour he would die. While this statement is not beyond challenge let us place beside it that of the automobilist who this very week was so elated at seeing his machine

winning at the race "dropped dead from overjoy." Then we have side by side the two statements:—

Hatred would kill
in an hour;

Joy *did* kill
in an instant,

making joy in this instance more powerful than hatred.*

Or, let me cite another authentic case of a man supposed to be lost at sea, leaving his wife and little ones to care for themselves. But he is not lost. A year or two later he returns unexpectedly and walks right in upon them. As soon as that loyal wife sees him she staggers, swoons, and falls into convulsions. A pure, strong, devoted, heavenly love for her rightful husband, a love involving all the strength of her womanly heart, has produced disease, weakness. If hatred, an evil, has done it on the one hand, then a pure heavenly love has done it on the other. Why not call it just what it is, a sudden emotion, good or evil, it matters not which, that has temporarily disturbed the bodily functions. And if jealousy and anger take away appetite, produce a foul breath and prevent sleep, how about love? More than once have I been called to a young maiden about going to the marriage altar, because she couldn't eat, couldn't sleep, and her breath was heavy. Was it because she was envious, or was hating anybody? Nay! It was out of the very abundance of her heart's love that she couldn't eat or sleep. It was because her cup of joy was running over.

Again, if bodily states are caused by mental states, then how do we account for the same diseases among animals? Then it must be that the cat that has diphtheria, for it does have it, or the cow that has tuberculosis must have them on account of some mental state that is theirs, must have them because there is some evil lurking in their conscious, or unconscious, minds which is causing it. And the cat and the cow must take a course in right thinking.

It is certainly true that all physical disease has its origin in

*We do not believe that joy or hatred would alone kill anybody, but that they are simply the last straw adding a trifle more burden to an already crippled organism—an underlying but undiscovered heart disease, or some other trouble.

what is evil, but not necessarily the evil of the man who is sick. If men had not swerved from the right and good way there never would have been any disease, or, as Swedenborg has stated it:—

If man had lived the life of good, in this case his interiors would be open to heaven, and through heaven to the Lord; thus also the smallest and invisible vessels . . . would be open also, and hence the man would be without disease. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 5726.)

So if men had not fallen there never would have been any noxious insects, any ferocious animals. They all exist from the general mass of evil in the other world and in this. But the ferocious animal does not necessarily take up his abode nearest to the ferocious man, nor the destructive moth enter and destroy the trees of him who is evil-minded and pass by those of his good neighbor across the way, nor the germ of diphtheria find lodgment in the throat of him who has some corresponding mental malady, and overlook others. But they all exist from this general influx of evil. For man has not only that special influx which comes down through his soul and mind into his body, but another which radiates, so to speak, directly or laterally into his body, without coming through the mind at all. And it is this common, or general influx, this influx which man has in common with the lower animals, which to my mind is the cause of disease. And this explains perfectly why man and animal having precisely the same influx may have, as they do have, precisely the same disease. This explains, too, why the innocent babe with no evil in its conscious mind may have a disease worse than the vilest sinner. Listen to Swedenborg's exposition of this very doctrine:—

There are at this day very many spirits who want to inflow not only into the thoughts and affections of man, but also into his speech and actions, and thus into his bodily things; when yet bodily things are exempt from particular influx of spirits and angels. (*Ibid.*, 5990.)

Note that "bodily things are exempt from particular influx," and so must be open to common or general influx. Those

spirits want to get into the body, and if they were the cause of disease, they would get in and stay there.

When Swedenborg speaks of the "troublesome heat" from the hells which acted upon his body and induced disease like that of a burning fever, I understand him to mean a general influx directly into his body, and not one coming through the mind or soul at all (*Ibid.*, 5715). And so when he speaks of "evil closing the smallest and quite invisible vessels, of which the next greater ones are composed," I think he may refer to this same general influx rather than any sin of the individual man which he can overcome. (*Ibid.*, 5726.)

At all events, there are these two entrances through which evil influences can flow into man's body, one by the door at the top, letting evil in through the mind down to the body, the other opening directly out from the body itself. And it is this latter, the common influx, which he speaks of as the preserver of the body. "For external beauty, which is of the body, derives its cause from the parents. . . . and afterwards is preserved by a common influx from the world." (Heaven and Hell, 99.)

So if every trace of evil could be removed from the mind, and the upper door shut tight and sealed against any inflow of evil that way, there would still be left this lower door through which evil could come in and disturb the body. Regeneration may shut to the upper door, barring the one influx of evil, and so in a measure letting the "heat and light of heaven into the interiors of the body" (Divine Love and Wisdom, 138), but so long as the other door, over which he has no control, remains open, there will always be one chief highway over which the influences which make for disease may enter the body, however pure the heart and mind may be. He has thoroughly screened his mental house above, but has left the lower front door wide open.

Again, in "Arcana Cœlestia," 5713:—

The infernals are not permitted to inflow into the solid parts of the body, but only into the cupidities and falsities. When man falls into disease, then only do they inflow into such things as belong to the disease.

That is, they cannot flow into the body unless disease is already there. They cannot cause the disease. They can live in it only after it has been caused by something else,—the common or general influx.

So we see how important it is to keep disease away, not simply for the body's welfare, but more important, that these infernal spirits may be kept at a safe distance from us.

And this brings us face to face with another New-Church teaching, which is that this world is the foundation of the other. The spiritual world is indeed the cause of the natural one, but we must remember that this world and its activities are just as essential to the very existence and well-being of those above, making the very foundations upon which they stand. The mind, it is true, has an influence over the body. But it is just as true that the body has an influence over the mind. The fact is they both act and react upon each other, and in physics we are taught that action and reaction are equal. Swedenborg says that the spirits of despondency stand upon the stomach, so when we clear or improve the stomach we strike the footing right from under those spirits who would infill us with despair. I am often asked what to do with cross, crying, peevish infants. Make the child well and you make the child happy every time. There are no exceptions. And it is a good deal so with grown people. The well man is the good-natured man, though by no means necessarily spiritual. Many a time we blame people for being cross and unreasonable when in reality some unknown disease is troubling them. The condition of the body does influence the mind. A cup of coffee produces a flow of thought. A pin thrust into the flesh causes angry feelings, and we are fortunate if the anger is limited, in this case, to mere feelings. An opiate administered in the hard muscle of the arm lifts the mind up to the seventh heaven of ecstasy and delight, so the man never realized such happiness before. Certain diseases of the flesh will make the mind a complete blank for days and weeks at a time. A tumor on the brain pressing upon certain nerve centers has driven the best of men to gross immoralities.

And they couldn't help it. So while not indorsing the statement as a whole, there is some truth in Oliver Wendell Holmes's remark, "What other men call sin I call simply disease." This accounts also for the actions of insane people. Do not understand me to mean, however, that removing physical disease will necessarily remove sin, or can, in any degree, make a spiritual-minded man, for it never can. Making a well body does not accomplish anything toward the real work of regeneration, but it does help to make a good-natured, easy-going, happy worldly man. Physical health and regeneration are two very distinct matters, so distinct indeed that one may be going on while the other is retrograding.

How often have I seen some of the most beautiful characters ripening out toward the end of life into the sweetest heavenly graces, and then when the last sickness is claiming the body, and the physical powers are just crumbling beneath it, the once happy feeling and pleasant word are lost. The foundation for them has gone. And if these bodily "foundations be destroyed what can the righteous" thought and feeling do?

Another doctrine of the church which is very germane to this subject is that of discrete degrees.* There is the body occupying the lowest physical plane, and enjoying its life as of itself. Then above it the mind with its mental acquisitions and enjoyments. And higher still the soul with its spiritual life and happiness. Now these three planes of life are very distinct. One does not merge down or shade off into the other, but each has its own laws and its own distinct kind of life. Obey physical law and you get physical life,—strong muscle, nerve, fibre. Obey mental law and you get mental breadth and acumen. Obey spiritual law and you get spiritual life and happiness, which are of an entirely different sort. Now

* The teaching in regard to "the limbus" and the different shadings on the same plane of life does not affect these discrete degrees. For example, on the material plane we have the earth, then the atmospheres, and above these the auras. But these three—earth, atmospheres, and auras—are all material; and between these, even the highest of them, and the spiritual, there is a distinct discrete degree.

that teacher would be foolish indeed who should say to his pupil, "Study harder and longer, and burn the midnight oil poring over your books, and you will thereby be growing stronger physically"; for he knows that the close student is such generally at the expense of his physique. And just as unwise is he who teaches, "Obey the commandments, the laws of spiritual life, and you will thereby attain physical health." That does not follow. As well say, "Obey the commandments and you will become large possessors of this world's goods," or "Obey the commandments and you will thereby be exempt from the law of gravitation," or reverse it and say, "Observe the law of gravitation, and you will, by so doing, become a regenerated soul." The spiritual cannot be mixed up with the material in that fashion. As well attempt to make the airship, fitted to the laws of mid-air, come down and move in the waters, or travel the common highways. But suppose we could make the upper work in the lower, so that right thinking and feeling would overcome physical disease, what then? Medicine is just as much a divinely appointed means of cure as mental states, as spiritual conditions, for "the Divine Providence concurs with such means of healing" (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 5713). Suppose a headache can be willed away, and the blood sent out of an overwrought brain by a similar effort. What's the gain? An ice cap will send out more blood in five minutes than a whole week of thinking. And when a local application, or a hot poultice, or a simple medicine will do the whole work almost at once, I have not yet persuaded myself of any advantage to be gained by taking this slow and roundabout way through mental processes.

A good deal has been said about the mental attitude of a patient, and how much depends upon his belief in the medicine he takes. I can only say I have not found it so. To my mind it makes absolutely no difference what one thinks or how he feels in regard to the medicine. If the medicine is good for anything it will help him whatever his state of mind. It will help him just as much if he lies absolutely unconscious. It

will help him just as much if he insanely resists it, thinking it is poison, as so many do. It will help the animal just as much as man. The fever will drop just as quickly, and precisely the same number of points in him who squirms and rebels at his cold bath as in him who requests and enjoys it.* The chill of malaria will stop in exactly the same number of minutes by the watch in him who ridicules his physician and the medicine he gives as in his most trusting patient. The wound of appendicitis will heal in exactly the same number of days in him who grumbles and curses his hard luck as he calls it, as in that beautiful, saintlike character who holds her Bible tight in her hand and close to her heart. And why not? "He makes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sends His rain on the just and on the unjust."

In the healing of every disease of whatsoever kind we cannot be too deeply impressed with the Lord's part of the work. He is the operator. We are the co-operators. More and more am I impressed that every patient of mine who has ever risen up from his sick bed on to his feet again has done so by the divine power. Not I, but the Lord, has cured him. And it is this fact that the Lord does so much that gives to different systems of healing their apparent cures. He has healed many a one in spite of medicine, in spite of mental healers, in spite of ignorance, in spite of negligence and poor and scanty food. Nineteen out of every twenty cases of grippe will get well without doing anything for it, if we are willing to bear it till that time. Pneumonia, even, is what the physician calls a self-limited disease, and many cases will recover alone if we are willing to run our chances with it. The arm may drop into boiling water and become scalded. Nine times out of ten it will take care of itself and heal. But if that arm is mine it is going to have an outward application which will make it feel better the moment it touches it. And more important by far it is going to be

*These experiments have been made by the author personally, with the help of trained nurses in his own and some of the larger hospitals where he has had to deal with over fifteen thousand patients.

dressed aseptically to prevent blood poisoning. It might get well itself, probably would, but it is going to have my little coöperation, the most intelligent I can render, that the Lord may have the open door through which He can come in and bless it.

Is it not this fact of the Lord's wonderful mercy in trying to help us even physically that gives to mental healing its apparent cures? The fact that a man has taken this medicine, and that, without any apparent help, and then gone to another doctor, or to a mental healer and got well, does not prove to my mind that the new doctor, or the mental healer, had anything to do with it. For example, one of my near neighbors grew sick with what was supposed to be an incurable growth. She had not turned over in bed for nine years, and was frightfully emaciated. Eight of the best physicians who attended her told me personally that it was a matter of only a few weeks or so with her. She was in such a complaining state of mind that all the physicians left her, feeling they could do her no good. She got up, got married, and now does all the housework for her husband and herself. If Christian Science had taken charge, everybody would have said, "See what Christian Science has done after all these others had given her up." But she got well, not by medicine, not by mental suggestion, not by the power of man, but by that of God. "It was indeed the Lord's doing, and it was marvellous in our eyes."

Another instance. Shortly ago a young lady who had always been in perfect health so far as known, was sewing the sleeve of a dress in which she was deeply interested, singing away cheerily. In an instant she was struck totally blind in one eye, partially blind in the other. (No fright observe, else it might be said that in the absence of all other known causes fright was the cause.) She could not distinguish with one eye the brightest sunlight from total darkness. I was called to do what I could for her. She grew no better, and I called in an oculist. After some weeks of no improvement I took her to one of the best oculists of the Boston Eye and Ear Infirmary,

who advised no change in treatment. It went on a little longer with no perceptible change. One day she was lying on a couch, fell asleep, rolled off, and struck her head against the hardwood floor with a thump. She got up and saw as perfectly as ever. A case of "Jumped into the barberry bush and scratched them in again." If she had taken treatment from a Christian Scientist the story would have run in this wise: "Had a doctor. Did no good. Had an oculist. No better. Went to best oculist of Boston. Still absolutely blind. Then consulted a Christian Scientist, and lo! within twenty-four hours the blind eyes saw." And the Christian Science banner is hung to the breeze.

So the wise physician takes no credit to himself when a patient whom other doctors have treated apparently in vain comes to him and gets well. It is simply a weekly occurrence with all of us. Even quacks, clairvoyants, imposters, patent-medicine vendors, all claim these wonderful cures.

Far be it from me to declare aught against any system of healing; for every one should be left in perfect freedom to choose his own. But I am frank to say that to fight a material foe with a mental weapon does seem to be incongruous, if not absurd. And yet it is no more absurd than it is for a physician to aim at a purely mental symptom with a heavy material weapon. I cannot conceive of any possible good accruing from thus firing up aimlessly into the air. But a mental weapon can meet and conquer a mental foe. Mind can help mind. And that brings us to the second division of our subject:

II. The healing of purely mental troubles.

We now step up from one discrete degree to another which lies directly above it. And by taking this one step upward we find ourselves standing on an entirely different platform.

Many a patient has said, "The doctor came and left me no medicine, but somehow he did me lots of good. I really do feel better for his coming." But observe, this is not an instance of mental healing as it is often cited to be. It is not an influence of mind over disease. It is an influence of mind over mind,

which is quite another matter. The disease is there just the same. The high fever and solid lung of pneumonia are precisely the same as before the doctor came, may be even growing worse to the end. But the physician's personality has given hope and cheer and buoyancy to the patient's mind, and that mental uplift has made him and those about him feel that he is better. And if he can keep that mental impression alive a few days longer, till the crisis passes and the lung is restored whole like as the other, then will he get the reputation of curing pneumonia by mental influence, which is not true. He has simply administered a mental medicine which has taken effect on the mental plane. But mind did not cause the pneumonia, and mind can never cure it.

So far we have been dealing with what the physician calls organic disease,—actual disease of body or the nervous system. But there is something more. There are mental conditions which need help. There are morbid states of mind, and nervous conditions which, while not depending so far as is now known upon any organic disease of the nervous system, are yet very real to the patient, and cause him untold misery. A patient recently, after suffering months of pain which was nothing bettered by all sorts of medicine, electricity, massage, etc., at last insisted upon surgery, contrary to her physician's advice. And when the organs were removed they were found to be strictly normal in every respect. The whole trouble was right in her head. There certainly are these neurasthenics. And there are many others who with trifling physical ailments—a little loss of sleep or appetite—are wont to dwell upon them, and exaggerate them, and worry over them. One man lies in his bed groaning over his wound. A child in the crib next to him is having a nice time with her dolly and picture books, while the same kind of wound is healing. A difference in mental attitude, not in physical conditions; for both are discharged well on the same day.

And that to my mind is the use of mental healing, for mind can influence mind. It can help morbid states of mind, but

by giving, I sometimes fear, a still more morbid mentality. But mental healing improved and purified, as it sometime will be, I predict has a future. I believe the time is coming when the physician and the mental healer will go hand in hand in their work, each the complement of the other, the physician dealing with organic disease of body and nerve, and the mental healer confining himself to the realm of morbid mental conditions, a field no less limited or important. Gladly would I pass over some of my cases to him, feeling that they do not need medicine, cases whom I have told do not need it, but rather need moral suasion. And he, on the other hand, will confine himself to his own mental province, and not attempt to cure a case of pneumonia, or of appendicitis which he cannot touch with mental weapons.

And this reminds me of two imminent dangers of mental healing which I should mention, or feel myself derelict to duty, the danger of losing (1) the natural life and (2) the mental equilibrium.

The first I will illustrate. I was called to a Christian Scientist who was supposed to be sick. I found her hard at work in the kitchen, for she was a boarding-house keeper. I asked her where she felt sick, and she said, "nowhere." I asked her if she had any pain, and she replied, "none," and that she felt as well as usual. I found her carrying a high fever and both lungs becoming solid with pneumonia. I called her husband aside and told him she was probably nearly through, but she ought to go to bed and be cared for. She insisted upon remaining up and making some biscuit for supper, and did so. She soon lapsed into unconsciousness and passed away. Just before her consciousness left her she told me she did have pain and did feel sick, but was taught not to say so, and what was more, to persuade herself it was not so, that her disease was only an illusion.

I speak frankly, as the need is, but I have seen those of this belief with heart disease, saying they were well, yet suffering week after week till death released them. I have seen them

with malignant growths becoming steadily worse, but as I enquired about them I was told they were getting better, and the growth was disappearing; but only for the undertaker to inform me a little later of their loathsome condition. I have seen children, the joy of father and mother, the pride of teacher and neighborhood, hurried on down to an untimely grave with appendicitis, while being told practically that there was nothing the matter with them. Still there is a divine providence, or at least a divine permission over it all, and some day the mental healer will do a work on the higher mental plane, which, in the Lord's hands, will be for the real betterment of mankind.

But the second danger, that of losing one's mental balance is, in my judgment, a far more grave one. I do not mean becoming insane, though that is to be thought of seriously, as the mind is held so continuously on one line of thought. But I mean the danger of losing one's individuality. Think of the danger of allowing any one else to come into our thoughts and manipulate them! Shall I give up to any man that sacred birthright of freedom which the Lord guards as the very apple of the eye? Shall I allow these questionable influences to rush in "where angels," even, "fear to tread"? Nay, shall I allow these secret, I had almost said, clandestine influences, to burst their way into the inner chambers of my life, when the Lord Himself, who gave me that life, only stands and knocks? No! we cannot afford to give up our mental control to any man, and it is not right that we should.

But instead thereof, think what mental helps we have right here in the New-Church teachings themselves! To him who has at his command the richest stores of truth not man-made, but God-given, to him who, through the opened Word can look up and find the precious gems of all holy living, the veritable pearls of great price, all other mental helps must seem of but paltry significance. Those truths are as high as heaven itself. They are as broad as humanity. They will help and sustain the mind in its direst needs. The teaching of the divine provi-

dence, far-reaching to the lily of the field and the very hairs of the head, the teaching of the Lord in His Divine Humanity, whereby He takes the infinite Divine Life and brings it right down among us, and just humanizes it for our every need, the teaching of the Grand Man and each individual use as an essential part of the grand whole,—all are of inestimable value. As a practical and everyday working means of help in overcoming these morbid states of mind, I know of nothing on earth to compare with this one teaching of real, definite usefulness. Not simply keeping busy, though that does take up the mind and help, but the pouring out of the whole mind and soul into helpful, neighbor-loving service. No need to tell that man not to worry, or to come out of his morbid state of mind, for he is so absorbed and so infilled with the spirit of his use that he can think of nothing else, and just goes singing to his task.

And this, to my mind, is the true position of the New-churchman. He will do all he can to preserve and strengthen the body for the sake of the use he can perform in it for others. But he will at the same time do what is of far greater moment, try to come into a true state of spiritual living. He will fulfil the law in all three planes of his being. He will obey physical law, and so attain physical health. He will cultivate his mind that he may have a larger and broader mental horizon. But, above all, he will fulfil all spiritual law, and so build up an ennobling and ever-developing spiritual character, which shall stand as long as the sun and moon endure, which shall be a tower of strength to all humanity about him, and which shall at last, in the upper and larger kingdom, receive the great Master's "Well done, good and faithful servant."

HENRY E. GODDARD.

SAMUEL MILLS WARREN.

THE vicissitudes of life in this country were strikingly illustrated in the career of our friend, the Rev. Samuel M. Warren, who passed into the other world Feb. 6, 1908, at the ripe age of eighty-six years. He was born in Dedham, Mass., Feb. 12, 1822, and was the sixth of ten children who lived to adult age. His father, Jesse Warren, an iron worker and plough maker, was then occupying a farm in that town. When Samuel was seven years old, the family removed to Peru, Vermont, and afterwards to Springfield in the same State. When a boy of fifteen, he was apprenticed to a farmer in Peru, under a verbal agreement that he would remain with him till he was twenty-one, and receive at the end of that time the sum of one hundred dollars and a suit of broadcloth clothes. "Not having been," as he says, "much of a party to the agreement," he brought it to a sudden termination about a year later, and went forth to seek his fortunes elsewhere. He found employment in Brooklyn, Long Island, and subsequently in New York city. There he had a severe illness, which led to his returning to Vermont, whence he soon went with the family to Keeseville, N. Y., where his father again established himself in business.

It was about this time, when Mr. Warren was a youth of eighteen or nineteen years, that he began to turn his thoughts to serious matters and to the need of obtaining a good education. He felt the importance of having a direct aim in life; and the legal profession looked especially attractive to him. Accordingly he entered on a course of study, while pursuing such other employment as he could secure. He taught a district school at Keeseville, and studied Latin and other branches in the evenings and early mornings. He read books in the public library and attended various academies. At one time he started an academy of his own. He worked on farms in summer, in

order that he might earn money to go to school in winter. He tried many other methods of raising funds, some of them involving great hardship. Once he went the distance from Philadelphia to Albany, where he had the promise of something to do, staying over night in New York, without a morsel of food, because he was penniless.

Later he became interested in the roofing business. The construction of roofs by means of tar, pitch, and paper was then a new industry. He saw the value of it, and was one of the first in the country to adopt it as a source of livelihood. Together with his brother Cyrus, he established himself in Cincinnati for the sake of engaging in this work. The enterprise was successful, and the foundations of a prosperous business were soon laid. But even in taking this step Mr. Warren did not lose sight of his ultimate goal, the legal profession. One condition of the partnership with his brother was that he should be at liberty, whenever circumstances permitted, to go on with the study of the law. This he did with as little delay as possible. In a lawyer's office and at the Harvard Law School, he was fitted for the bar, to which in due time he was admitted. Then he caught the California gold fever, and would have set out across the plains to the mines if he had not, at the last moment, been dissuaded by his friends. He had good reason to consider himself fortunate in the failure of this project, as the party with which he would have travelled never reached their place of destination.

The foregoing facts were gleaned from a sketch which he himself furnished to a genealogical work on the Warren family. Though, as we have seen, he was admitted to the bar, he never practised law. About this time a great change came over his life. He became acquainted with the doctrines of the New Church, and eagerly embraced them. Of the effect which they had upon him he writes as follows:—

They taught me what I had never seen nor suspected before, that the motive which had governed me and pushed me on all these years, mere personal ambition, was a selfish and evil motive. I had not looked upon

the legal profession as a sphere of usefulness, in which I could perform public service for the good of others; and I could not all at once feel my old interest in the profession with the motive under condemnation which had led me to it. Under these circumstances I caught the gold fever, not so much for the love of gold as from the love of adventure which most young men have, and as a relief from my then state of unsettled purpose.

The result of this mental conflict was that Mr. Warren gave up the law and studied for the ministry. His tutor was Dr. Nathan Clark Burnham, who was then resident in Cincinnati, but who, in 1850, removed with his family to Peoria, Ill. Thither Mr. Warren accompanied him, and later to Philadelphia, where Dr. Burnham afterwards had his home. In 1852 he was licensed to preach, and his first sermons were delivered in Darby, near Philadelphia. But soon, not being well, he planned a tour in Europe, intending, among other things, to take a course of study in some German university. In England, within a fortnight after his arrival, he met the lady who became his wife, Miss Sarah Anne Broadfield, of Manchester. They were married in 1855. Until 1864, when he became the minister of the society in Brookline, Mass., he divided his time between this country and England. For a while he preached for the Cross Street Society in London, as an associate of the Rev. William Bruce, and afterwards as his successor.

Mr. Warren was ordained June 24, 1865, soon after his settlement in Brookline. He remained in the service of the Brookline Society for several years, and had no other regular charge in America. But, though not engaged in preaching, and finding it necessary to devote more or less time to business, he never ceased to be active in the cause of the Church. He was a most efficient member of the Boston Society, with which he became connected in 1882. For many years he served on its Church Committee, and was the valued teacher of an adult class. Those who had the benefit of his instruction will always look back to it with a high sense of appreciation and gratitude. He was also deeply interested in the church at large, and seldom failed to be present at its general meetings. Frequent

attendants at Convention will easily recall the useful part which he so often took in its deliberations. It was, however, with his pen, that his greatest and most continuous service to the church was performed. His revision and expansion of Woodbury M. Fernald's "Compendium of Swedenborg" will long stand as a memorial of his faithful labors. His recent translation of Swedenborg's "Marriage Love" is a fine specimen of his scholarship and industry. His contributions to the *NEW-CHURCH REVIEW* and other periodicals will long be remembered as among their most valuable contents.

If we consider our friend's noticeable characteristics, one of the first to come to mind will be his never-failing optimism. In the varied circumstances which he had to meet he was almost invariably hopeful. This cheerful spirit continued with him to the end. More than most younger men, he was interested, even in old age, in the events of the day, and in the world around him. The march of modern improvement was to him a source of constant and sympathetic pleasure. He seems to have inherited from his father a genius for mechanical invention, and in the very last hours of his earthly life was busy with a contrivance which he had devised for utilizing as fuel the waste product of forests.

Another marked trait of his character was thoroughness and close attention to details. Whatever he set out to do was sure to be done well. This painstaking habit prevented his being a rapid worker, but made him a most trustworthy one. He was never satisfied to leave any point unsettled for lack of proper investigation. His translations and other literary efforts show the signs of this unwearying care. The same accuracy conduced to an intimate and correct knowledge of the doctrines and increased his capacity as a spiritual teacher.

From his first reception of the New-Church writings Mr. Warren seems to have had no doubt of their absolute truth. They came to him at a time when he was greatly perplexed on religious questions; and he has often said that they saved him from infidelity. They were always, in his view, a complete

new revelation from the Lord. Yet was his understanding of them most intelligent and rational. As a writer and preacher he was lucid, direct, and simple, free from dogmatism, happy in his attempts to accommodate the truth to the states of readers and hearers. Genial in his disposition, courteous in his manners, loyal in his friendships, he will be greatly missed by those who have known and loved him here on earth. Without a moment's pain, he fell asleep in this world to wake up in the other. In the gentleness and peace of his departure we may discern the love which is over all, and which cannot fail them in the eternal future. We can think of him as saying when he awoke to the perception of spiritual realities, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

JAMES REED.

THE SEMI-INSANE AND SWEDENBORG.*

THAT there may be insanity in some things and not in others, and that it may be of various degrees, and that responsibility should be determined accordingly in the treatment of criminals, is the chief contention of this work by an eminent scientific expert. This is sufficient to extend the interest in it to all thoughtful members of society, for society itself has a grave responsibility in the matter, and one can never know when he himself, or those dear to him, may not become involved practically in the problem.

But in addition to this an extensive study of psychopathy is presented, and the relation of insanity to genius is intelligently considered. It is in this connection that Swedenborg is taken as an example, together with a long list of the great in philosophy, literature, music, and art, Socrates and Pascal, Auguste Comte and Saint Simon, heading the list; and among those that follow are Descartes, Voltaire, Buffon, Victor Hugo, Schopenhauer, Isaac Newton, Oliver Cromwell, Goethe, Coleridge, Schiller, Byron, Darwin, Schumann, Chopin, Wagner, Mozart, and Beethoven,—all classed among the semi-insane who have a "social value."

The theory upon which such conclusions are based is that there are psychical localizations just as there are sensory and motor (p. 41). The psychic neurons, the author believes, can be localized in the cerebral cortex (p. 42). The personality is the unity of this cerebral life (p. 45). Nevertheless the organ of it, the psychical center, is multiple and divisible (p. 46).

**The Semi-Insane and Semi-Responsible* (Demifous et Demiresponsables). By Joseph Grasset, Professor of Clinical Medicine at the University of Montpellier; National Member of the French Academy of Medicine, and Laureate of the Institute. Authorized American Edition, Translated by Smith Ely Jelliffe, M. D., Ph. D. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company. December 1907. 8vo Cloth. 470 pp. \$2.50 net.

This is illustrated by a polygon with the conscious personality, free-will, and the responsible *ego*, above; and below, connected by lines, on the right, are the centers respectively of touch, seeing, and hearing; and opposite them, on the left, are the centers for general movements, for speech, and for writing. Any of these lower centers may be dissociated from the *ego*, or center of conscious personality, and may act, more or less, without it, as in somnambulism. So the centers of psychic activity may escape from the control of the *ego*, and act under what is called the *subego*, sub-conscious to the *ego*. Of the same order is the dissociation on which natural sleep depends:—

In neuropaths, the *ego* and *subego* cease to be one and conjointly responsible. . . . In consequence psychic activity escapes in a considerable degree from the control of reason, from the *ego*, and falls into a too restricted dependence upon the sub-conscious *ego*; that is to say, into a state of unconsciousness. In hysteria the functioning of the brain is more or less dissociated, and the subconscious *ego* extends and enlarges its empire to the detriment of the *ego*. In hypnosis consciousness no longer exists. The unity of our life seems ruptured, and the brain given up to suggestions from without, is capable of nothing but an automatism as perfect as it is unconscious. The *subego* rules as master, but acts blindly. (pp. 46, 47.)

The cerebral center of reason and of thought being complex and divisible, one understands that there may be, in men of good health, an unequal development of certain faculties, and one can foresee the theme which I shall develop a little later (Chapter IV) that a man may be intelligent and yet irrational, and that a man of talent and even of genius may nevertheless be lacking in good sense. One can also foresee that according to the number and the nature of the psychic neurons affected, in a given person, reason may be completely submerged or only partially altered in a proportion varying according to the case. (p. 48.)

Changes in the inferior psychism, the *subego*, which disturb the reason without destroying it, are those which make the semi-insane, while the more profound changes of the superior psychism, the *ego*, destroy the reason and make the insane. (p. 49.)

The famous doctrine that genius, the *ne plus ultra* of intellectual activity, is a form of insanity, a disease, a non-convulsive manifestation of epilepsy, is denied. Dr. Grasset holds instead, that,—

Genius is not a neurosis; but a neurosis is more often the penalty of genius. (p. 267.)

The common trunk which unites superiority and neuroses is a temperament, but is not a disease. (p. 266.)

Indeed, it is urged that this penalty which so often overtakes men of superior powers, either from temperamental conditions or from overwork, handicaps them, and that their lives would be much more fruitful if it could be prevented or cured.

This seems well, but when Swedenborg is classed with the semi-insane geniuses who have been of "social value," notwithstanding their infirmity, it seems to us to be from a lack of knowledge of the subject. For, while his intellectual superiority led Emerson to speak of him as a "mastodon of literature not to be measured by whole colleges of ordinary scholars," still there is no reasonable ground for doubting that his health was excellent, and his brain intact, to a ripe age of eighty-four. Nevertheless we find the following:—

Gilbert Ballet [Swedenborg; *History of a Visionary of the Eighteenth Century*. 1890] has described and minutely analyzed the hallucinations of Swedenborg, the theosophist of the eighteenth century, who established the cult of the New Jerusalem and who was the most fertile and original of all the hallucinatory mystics. (pp. 249, 250.)

And one of the reasons for considering Berlioz semi-insane is given as follows:—

. . . the credulity with which he regarded the visions of Swedenborg, who pretended to know the language of demons. (p. 255.)

This attitude of mind towards the supernatural is absolutely unscientific. Nothing new could ever be discovered if a man who announces anything which is incredible to some others is to be immediately pronounced by the medical expert as semi-insane. Then Galileo was, indeed, semi-insane when he discovered the motion of the earth. "But he could demonstrate it to reason," it may be answered. So could Swedenborg demonstrate every one of his spiritual discoveries to reason, and hundreds of sane men, of high standing for practical usefulness

have since followed his rational explanations of the Sacred Scriptures, and of the spiritual world, with the deepest satisfaction; and one who regards them as semi-insane for what he terms their "credulity" is simply ignorant of the whole matter.

How does Dr. Grasset know that there is not a spiritual world, and that communication with it is impossible. Has his science proved beyond a doubt that there is nothing in existence but this material universe, and that nothing can be known except by the use of the material senses, and that any belief in anything else is invariably caused by neurosis?

But this is the only ground for classing Swedenborg with the semi-insane. It is the only ground for classing Socrates with them, because he heard and obeyed a supernatural voice. Upon the same ground Moses and all the prophets of the Old Testament, and the Lord Jesus and his followers in the New, must be so classed. And all the fruits of Christianity, of which Christian civilization is a part, must be attributed to the hallucinations of the semi-insane. Thus Dr. Grasset's own conclusions, that genius is not a neurosis, are brought to naught, since everything that lifts humanity out of the dust and gives it any relation to God and the higher things of His kingdom of love and immortality, we owe to the hallucinations of the semi-insane.

This is the weak point in the book to which the author's attention should be called. His positions may be good in matters of natural science, but in illustrating them he should be careful not to mistake cases of genuine seership for those of neurosis. He should take pains to get correct and full information concerning them. Neurosis could never result in such a perfect logical system of theology and religion as that found in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, in which reason on the part of the believer is exalted as the *sine qua non*.

H. CLINTON HAY.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE RECOGNITION OF SWEDENBORG'S GREATNESS.

THE world has recently witnessed an event of extraordinary interest and importance. In the press dispatches of the newspapers of all the principal nations and tongues of the earth it was heralded far and wide that England and Sweden had joined in showing honor to a supremely great man, and one who will more and more be seen to occupy a unique place in the history of mankind.

On the 8th of April last Swedenborg's earthly remains were removed from their resting-place in the little Swedish chapel in London, and carried back to his native land.

The circumstances of this removal give to it a peculiar significance.

In the first place, it involved the formal action of the two nations most closely associated with Swedenborg's career. It was done at the formal request of the Swedish government and with the formal consent of the government of Great Britain. Representatives of both governments took official part in the ceremonies of disinterment and transfer. The body was received and transported on a Swedish ship of war, and is to be re-entombed in the Cathedral of Upsala.

But the real importance of the occasion is only faintly suggested by these impressive formalities. The general recognition of Swedenborg's services to mankind and the spontaneous tributes called forth by this occasion are ample evidence that his fame is established, and that his work will in time be appreciated.

Nothing could be greater than the contrast between the simplicity and obscurity of Swedenborg's death and burial and the world-wide publicity of this return of his ashes to their final resting-place, except possibly that between the secluded life in a London boarding-house and the immortal work he was then doing. What a strange environment for one who was "living the most real life of his time"! and yet we have here a glimpse of the true character of Swedenborg's greatness. His true greatness was spiritual, but this has hardly yet dawned

upon the thought of the world. It is a sad commentary upon the capacity of men to recognize preëminent worth that the obscurity of Swedenborg's quiet life in London represented precisely the neglect which the world showed his characteristic work, his writings on spiritual subjects. Sectarian animosity and religious prejudices so completely overwhelmed his personality and his influence that even his scientific labors were forgotten and despised. But now the justice of history is vindicated in the fact that the most significant feature of this occasion, so impressive from the worldly point of view, is the revival of interest in Swedenborg's scientific works and a fresh appreciation of his scientific attainments. The genuine interest of the present time in Swedenborg's scientific works, as evidenced by the fact that the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences is now engaged in preparing a complete edition of all that he wrote on scientific subjects, including both what he himself published and what he left in manuscript, this remarkable and substantial interest, is a genuine revival; for in the early forties of the eighteenth century Swedenborg's scientific reputation was well established. His books were favorably noticed in the foremost scientific periodical of the time, *Acta Eruditorum*. He had princes as his patrons. He was a high official of the Swedish government, and an influential member of the House of Lords. He was rapidly coming to a commanding position, both in European politics as well as in European science. If he had continued his systematic labors in the fields of physiology and psychology, and had published his monumental work on the brain, there is no question that he would have been hailed as the leading scientist of his day.

As a matter of fact, however, he abruptly terminated his scientific career, and, as was supposed, gave himself up to the pursuit of other-world vagaries, and fell a victim to the workings of a diseased imagination. His fame and influence as a scientist were completely submerged and obscured in the character of seer and false prophet. Distrust, misconception, misrepresentation, derision, and public aversion took the place of universal esteem and admiration. Only his private life and his conduct among men remained unimpaired. In the meantime he was working quietly at his new task and fulfilling his unique mission, none other than that of inaugurating the greatest religious revolution since the introduction of Christianity,—a rejuvenation and a reinterpretation of Christianity, of Christian docu-

ments, in fact, with the result, under the Divine guidance, of unfolding the deeper meaning of the Sacred Scriptures. History affords many instances of human blindness and ingratitude, but the neglect and condemnation of Swedenborg by the world, especially the religious world, is unparalleled. While Swedenborg was writing the "*Arcana Cœlestia*," the "*Apocalypse Explained*," "*Conjugal Love*," and the "*True Christian Religion*," the world was almost unconscious of his existence. The few who knew what he was doing were, for the most part, incredulous and indifferent, not to say positively hostile.

The simplicity, the steadiness, the marvellous industry, and the sublime confidence with which he worked at his solitary task, is one of the strangest feats in history, and yet it is hardly more strange than that the bones of this lonely and despised worker should, after more than a century and a quarter, be taken from their obscure resting-place and deposited in the full splendor of historic associations; hardly more strange than that the buried volumes of his printed books and manuscripts should be now resurrected and brought out into the full glare of scientific interest and prominence.

May we not take this reawakening of interest in Swedenborg's scientific achievements as a forerunner of a world-wide movement towards a more serious study and a fuller appreciation of him as a spiritual teacher of transcendent character, as in very deed the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose mission it was and is to bring to men that system of revealed and rational truth which is signified by the New Jerusalem, the Holy City descending from God out of heaven.

L. F. H.

IMMORTALITY AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

FOR many years the tendency of natural science has been to doubt or deny immortality. Herbert Spencer's influence was to relegate the subject to the realm of the unknowable; while Ernst Haeckel's was to fasten attention upon the material universe as the only possible plane of existence. John Fiske did something to counteract these influences, by showing that mind and matter are distinct, and that evolution points to life-everlasting for the mind, when the limits of material progress have been reached. But now Sir Oliver Lodge,

of England, than whom no scientist of greater renown lives to-day, has presented a profoundly logical contribution to the subject, which gives us a right to conclude that the tide of agnosticism and denial has turned, and that even with natural science it is setting strongly in the opposite direction. The article occupies considerable space in two numbers of the *Hibbert Journal* (published by Sherman, French & Co., Boston, and Williams & Norgate, London). The strength of its position lies in the fact that it is based upon the established principles of natural science, and especially upon the fundamental laws, the conservation of energy and permanence of matter.

He begins with a searching definition of man, objecting to the question, "Has man an immortal soul?" And also to the statement, "Man is a soul having a body." For man, he holds, is a union of both, and without the one or the other he becomes something else. This is contrary to a spiritual conception of man, it seems to us, and is hardly consistent with Professor Lodge's own subsequent reasoning which is quite spiritual. But he uses it simply as a scientific man's way of getting at his subject. He only wishes to say that not all of man thus defined is immortal, but only the soul, the part which is dissociated from the body at death. But it may be objected, that this part of man is more an interrelation, that it is vitality. Admitting, then, that vitality is a relation of something else with the body, it is this something else which is to be discussed under the name of soul.

He opens the discussion by showing that there is nothing in the material body which persists, or gives any hopes of immortality, but the atoms of which it is composed; and the notion that these same atoms may be re-collected for purposes of resurrection he shows to be unscientific and untenable in a manner that has scarcely been equalled, as the following will show:—

The present body is wholly composed of terrestrial particles; it consists of atoms of matter collected from food and air, and arranged in a certain complicated and characteristic form. The elemental atoms are first combined into the complex aggregate called protoplasm, which is an unstable compound whose chemical constitution is at present unknown, but whose property it is to be always in a state of flux; it is not rigid or stagnant, or fixed, but is constantly breaking down into simpler constituents, on one side, and constantly being renewed or built up on the other, so that it has a kind of life-history for a certain period. This period of activity in any given case lasts as long as the balance between association and dissociation continues. While the balance is tilting

in favor of assimilation, we have the period of youth and growth; when the balance begins to tilt in favor of disintegration, we have the commencement of old age and decay; until at a certain, or rather an uncertain stage, the disintegrating forces gain a final victory, and assimilation wholly and sometimes suddenly ceases. Then presently and by slow degrees the residue of the protoplasm left in the body, unless it is speedily incorporated into some other animal or plant, is resolved into its simpler and simpler compounds, and ultimately into inorganic constituents; and so is restored to mother earth whence it sprang. (*Hibbert Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 294.)

Thus the body is seen to be constantly changing, never twice composed of the same atoms. It matters not therefore what bodies we may have so long as they are suitable vehicles or modes of manifestation in this or any future state of existence. The individuality lies deeper than any body with which the soul may be clothed, and must belong to that which puts the particles of the body together in this shape and not another. The same material elements may have been successively employed in forming a blade of grass, a worm, or a lamb, or a man. What is it that combines and arranges the particles in each instance? What is the controlling entity in each? He answers:—

We call it life, we call it soul, we call it by various names, and we do not know what it is. But common sense rebels against its being “nothing”; nor has any genuine science presumed to declare that it is purely imaginary. (*Ibid.*, p. 297.)

The soul is that controlling and guiding principle which is responsible for our personal expression and for the construction of the body, under the restrictions of physical condition and ancestry. In its higher development it includes also feeling and intelligence and will, and is the storehouse of mental experience. The body is its instrument or organ, enabling it to receive and to convey physical impressions, and to affect and be affected by matter and energy. (*Ibid.*, p. 298.)

Professor Lodge does not shrink from the universal application of this definition. He frankly admits that life is not matter nor energy, but the guiding and directing principle in all things, which is only saying in other words, as Swedenborg does, that the spiritual world is the world of causes, and the natural the world of effects (*Divine Love and Wisdom*, 134). He says the soul is related to the bodily organism in somewhat the same way as the “Logos” is related to the universe; it is that without which it does not exist,—that which vivifies and constructs, or composes and informs, the whole. Thus without knowing it he employs the New-Church doctrine of correspondence as well as that of discrete degrees. And

in doing so he points to the material world as evanescent, transitory, the assemblages of material elements made by spirit or soul of some kind about itself for the sake of expression; but that which does the assembling, the soul, the spiritual, is permanent and abiding. So the human soul goes on day after day, year after year, assembling matter into the human form; the soul of the horse and of the oak-tree likewise persist in assembling matter in their respective forms. So by spirit the universe is constantly and continually made to appear in changing forms, out of the invisible atmospheres. There is great beauty of expression as well as of thought in this, as will be shown by the following extract:—

Never in physical science do we surmise for a moment that something suddenly springs into being from previous non-existence. All that we perceive can be accounted for by changes of aggregation, by assemblage and dispersion. Of material aggregates we can trace the history, as we can trace the history of continents and islands, of suns and planets and stars; we can say, or try to say, whence they arose and what they will become; but never do we state that they will vanish into nothingness, nor do we ever conjecture that they rose from nothing. (*Ibid.*, pp. 301, 302.)

So he speaks of the dewdrop, or of the cloud, appearing and vanishing:—

Its perceptible or incarnate existence is temporary. As a drop it was born, and as a drop it dies; but as aqueous vapor it persists: an intrinsically imperishable substance, with all the properties persisting which enabled it to condense into a drop or cloud. Even it, therefore, has the attribute of immortality.

So, then, what about life? Can that be a nonentity which has built up particles of carbon and hydrogen and oxygen into the form of an oak, of an eagle, or of a man? Is it something which is really nothing; and soon shall it be manifestly the nothing that an ignorant and purblind creature may suppose it to be? Not so; nor is it so with intellect and consciousness and will, nor with memory and love and adoration, nor all the manifold activities which at present strangely interact with matter and appeal to our bodily senses and terrestrial knowledge; they are not nothing, nor shall they ever vanish into nothingness or cease to be. They did not arise with us: they never did spring into being; they are as eternal as the Godhead itself, and in the eternal Being they shall endure forever. (*Ibid.*, p. 304.)

Now two tendencies of this reasoning may be noticed: one, that all souls, those of animals and even of plants, are immortal, as well as those of men; the other, that their immortality is in God and not in themselves as individuals. Professor Lodge is not unmindful of these difficulties. He meets them by a consideration of individuality

or personality. Is human character to be regarded as a temporary assemblage or a permanent entity? He says:—

A memory, a consciousness, and a will, in so far as they form a consistent, harmonious whole, constitute a personality; which thus has relations with the past, the present, and the future. And we shall argue that personality or individuality dominates and transcends all temporal modes of expression, and so is essentially eternal. (*Ibid.*, p. 564.)

And here again we notice an approach to the teachings of the New Church, for attention is called to the fact that while the life of a tree or an insect must in some sort persist, not so its personal character, for it has none. It is only one of a group. This, Swedenborg teaches, is true of all life except human. It all comes by general influx from the spiritual world mediately, and there is no direct influx from the Lord, upon which the human personality depends. This immediate connection with the Lord Himself gives immortality to the individual, while there is, indeed, a sort of general or group immortality for all other forms of life, because all life is spiritual and essentially in the spiritual world.

And something like this is true also of the human body. It, in common with the animals, exists also by a general influx from the spiritual world, and would have no more individuality than that of an animal if it were not for the added direct influx of the soul into it. Nevertheless, it is transitory, like the bodies of animals, and not immortal.

It is this distinction between general and particular influx of life, of which Professor Lodge is ignorant, which not only explains the difference between animals and men, but also explains much of what modern science is trying to solve in its problems of the subliminal. For instance, in the present article we read:—

Whatever it is that controls our physiological mechanism, it is certainly not our own consciousness; nor is it any part of our recognized and obvious personality. (*Ibid.*, p. 578.)

The writer tries to suggest an explanation in the doctrine of the subliminal, which is defined as:—

The theory of a larger and permanent personality, of which the conscious self is only a fraction in process of individualization, the fraction being greater or less according to the magnitude of the individual. (*Ibid.*, p. 577.)

That there is a reaching out after and preparation for the New-

Church doctrine of the discrete degrees of the soul, or spiritual man—in association with spirits in the world of spirits, and with angels in the heavens, and inmosty in conjunction with the Lord of life; and by such associations enabled to think and feel above and beyond our terrestrial spheres of experience—is made manifest by the following illustration used by Professor Lodge in this connection:—

Our present state may be likened to that of the hulls of ships submerged in a dim ocean among many strange beasts, propelled in a blind manner through space, proud perhaps of accumulating many barnacles as decoration; only recognizing our destination by bumping against the dock wall. With no cognizance of the deck and the cabins, the spars and the sails; no thought of the sextant and the compass and the captain; no perception of the lookout on the mast, of the distant horizon; no vision of objects far ahead, dangers to be avoided, destinations to be reached, other ships to be spoken with by other means than bodily contact; a region of sunshine and cloud, of space, of perception, and of intelligence, utterly inaccessible to the parts below the waterline. (*Ibid.*, p. 578.)

There is an approach also to the New-Church doctrine of the spiritual body, for while that of the resurrection of the material body is shown to be unscientific, nevertheless both science and reason require a vehicle or mode of manifestation for the soul after its separation from matter. Every real personal existence must have a double aspect, not spiritual alone, nor physical alone, but in some way both. So “an ethereal or other entity constituting the persistent or ‘other aspect’ and fulfilling the functions which the atoms of terrestrial matter now fulfil, is required by scientific thought for immortality.” (pp. 294, 295.)

H. C. H.

A FACTOR OFTEN OVERLOOKED IN OUR STUDY OF SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

AN earnest and thoughtful layman, who, in the midst of an active business career, has accustomed himself to focus the clear light of the New Church upon the burning questions of the day and to view them with quiet eyes, not long since wrote a brief communication to one of our periodicals, in which occur the following words:—

There are those who see in the present social conditions the ultimatum of the evils and falsities of a church long since passed away. I do not see it so. I see rather the ultimatum of the new heavens and the rearranged hells,—the

heavens more potent than ever before and the hells better governed and restrained. That joy to the world is coming from the second coming of the Lord cannot be reasonably doubted.

Here is presented to us a factor in our present-day life which, while theoretically acknowledged in the New Church, while held with undoubting faith by all who are intelligent in the truths now rationally revealed to men, is still largely left out of practical account in our estimate of existing conditions.

The Lord's coming in the flesh gained, at the time, very slight recognition among men. Yet to-day that advent gives to the Christian world its name, and from it everything therein dates. Christendom universally accepts the fact that what is known as the Lord's first coming marked a crisis in human history.

And the existence of the New Church is based upon its faith that a little more than one hundred and fifty years since, the Lord made his promised second coming to men,—a coming as the spirit of truth to lead us into all truth, — which likewise marked a crisis in human history. For by means of that coming there was wrought in the World of Spirits a general judgment upon those who had long been gathered there, resulting in the formation of a new heaven and a new hell. The intermediate realm was thus relieved of the presence of an element which, as it were, interposed a thick cloud between this world and the heavens. This cloud being dissipated by means of the last judgment, it thenceforward became possible for the well-disposed to receive truth and good from the Lord more readily than before. We read in the "Apocalypse Explained," 1217, respecting this judgment and its results as follows:—

When the good had been separated from the evil, and the evil had been cast into hell, all the good came into a better state for receiving truth and good from the Lord, a state in which they had not been before. For so long as they were held in connection with the evil, if they had received goods and truths, they would have defiled and perverted them. For the same reason interior truths were not revealed on the earth until that separation had been effected by means of the last judgment. This too is the meaning of the words in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come . . . on earth as in the heavens" (MATT. vi. 10). The Lord's kingdom existed before the last judgment, for the Lord always rules both heaven and earth; but after the last judgment the state of the Lord's kingdom became different from the state before it, for after it the reception of Divine truth and good became more universal, more interior, more easy, and more distinct.

This potent factor in the descent of the underlying principles of the Lord's kingdom into the thoughts and the hearts of men, and in the gradual, but very measurable, realization of those principles in the life of the world at large, is never to be lost sight of in the New Church. But it is not a factor that is speedily to overpower evil and bring in good. And it is just here that our thought is often at fault. The new light and the new life that are now descending into the world through the avenues opened by means of the last judgment and the second coming of the Lord, cannot override the freedom of individual men. It is indeed true that the presence of this inflow of light and life means a wonderful opening of the way before men for their release from the bonds of evil and falsity; but it also means the most careful conservation of human freedom. The "new age" is an age of greater liberty than the world has known in the past; but the very essence of that liberty is that men may act "in freedom from reason" more perfectly than ever before. Its nature is effectively shown in the work on the "Last Judgment," 74, where it is said, "Now that man's liberty is restored, he can better perceive interior truths, if he desires to perceive them, and thus become more internal, if he wills to become so."

Hence the beneficent effects of the Lord's coming cannot be seen at once. In the very nature of the case they must be slowly realized. And, as respects this world, they can never be perfectly realized. For this world is not the world of fruition and was never meant to be such. Yet it certainly can be bettered. It can be shorn of many of its painful and revolting features. But it must always remain a world of preparation, of training, and of discipline. And the earnest, thoughtful soul will keep both of these aspects of life steadily in view. On the one hand there will ever be present with such, a quick readiness to help forward all orderly movements to improve the conditions of living in this world, and on the other hand a readiness not less prompt to recognize the presence of a wise and tender providence, entering permissively into all the vicissitudes incidental to the probationary character of the natural world and its life.

And there is another fact of vital moment to any just estimate of the social conditions that confront us to-day, which must never be allowed to escape our notice. Greater liberty to the well-disposed means also greater liberty to the evil-disposed. The very instrumentalities that, under the beneficent providence of the Lord, are

doing so much to ameliorate human conditions during man's brief stay in this world, under the grasping rule of self-seeking men may for a time make these conditions worse, even, than in the earlier and darker days when the heavens were clouded and liberty was restrained. There can be no liberty to do greater good that, as far as this world is concerned, cannot be perverted to the doing of greater evil.

In view of these facts what are the immediate duties that rest upon us? First of all, we are to be optimistic. We are to keep steadfastly before us the grand, uplifting truth set forth so concisely and yet fully in the divine utterances of the ninety-seventh Psalm, which begins with the words:—

The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about Him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne . . .

and which ends with this clear statement of genuine truth,

Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart. Rejoice in the Lord, ye righteous; and give thanks at the remembrance of His holiness.

The reign of the Lord is the reign of infinite love guided by wisdom as infinite as itself. It is a reign that provides nothing but good, and yet, of necessity, permits the evil that comes of man's perversion of good, through the misuse of his essential freedom.

And so we are brought face to face with the beautiful, ennobling truth that we have a part in the Lord's providence, a share in the Lord's rule. As with optimistic eyes we witness the Lord's dealings with men we see that no mistakes can be made by Him, that everything is the best that possibly can be under the conditions; but we come to realize with new distinctness that we are a part of these conditions, and have the power of improving them. Thus there is a sense in which much of the outward beneficence of the Lord's rule may be said to rest with us. It is true that we can do nothing of ourselves, but it is not less true that we can do a great deal in conscious freedom, as of ourselves. Very clearly and forcibly is this coöperation with the Divine Providence set before us, together with its happy results, in the words of the thirty-seventh Psalm:—

Wait on the Lord, and keep His way and He shall exalt thee to inherit the land; when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it.

The Lord operates, we are to coöperate. His providence is to lead, we are simply to wait on that providence. He is to be left to mark out the way, and it is for us to keep, or as the term is often rendered, to "observe," His way. All this requires patience, but the divine promise is, "In your patience ye shall win your souls." It is through this patient, humble co-laboring with the Lord that the very end of human living is realized.

And now we may ask, how should this co-laboring specifically ultimate itself? The answer is near at hand, it is plain, it is familiar. Indeed so simple and familiar is it that there is always danger of its losing something of its weight and significance, with the many. It is in the individual living of a life of use. When the Lord was present in the flesh and was asked to name the great commandment of the law He replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," to which He adds: "And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And now, at the period of the Lord's second coming, when the concise teachings of the letter of the Word are fully and rationally unfolded to us, we are taught that "Christian charity," or love of the neighbor, "with every one, consists in the faithful doing of the duties of his calling."

To the thoughtful mind this is but the statement of a self-evident principle. Were every one occupying a place of use, and faithfully fulfilling the duties pertaining to that place, the disorders that are so much deplored would, to a large degree, cease. When the Lord would set before us the highest ideal of satisfying life in the other world, He says, "In my Father's house are many mansions, I go to prepare a place for you." The individual place to be occupied and filled marks the fruition of life. For that place the Lord would have us prepare. And in no possible way can we prepare more effectually than by the endeavor to live a life of love to the neighbor here and now, through rendering faithful, conscientious service in the positions we are at present called to occupy.

As a striking illustration of the way in which rational truths like this are absorbed by thoughtful minds we need but quote the following paragraph from one of the forceful addresses of Governor Hughes of New York:—

If we could secure the administration of every office in accordance with its obligations and in adequate fulfilment of the fair intent of the Constitution and statutes creating it, we should find almost all our problems solved. That which

is right in our system of government would appear revealed in the beauty of perfect adaptation; . . . and, on the other hand, such imperfections as existed would stand out in such bold relief as to leave little room for doubt as to the necessary remedy.

And when this keen-sighted thinker recognizes the fact that the vexed problems of state-rule would be practically solved "if we could secure the administration of every office in accordance with its obligations," he but grasps a principle of unlimited application, he but lays hold of a law of universal order. To apply the principle to the solution of the problems of the State would simply be to see to it that as far and as fast as possible the offices in the gift of the commonwealth should be actually administered in accordance with their obligations. Every place so filled would help forward the establishment of civic order, and mark a distinct step toward its realization.

And the same truth holds upon the higher and broader plane occupied by the world at large. The gospel of the "new age," the gospel that places beside the wonderfully significant words of the Lord, "I go to prepare a place for you," those other and correlative statements, "Christian charity with every one consists in doing faithfully the duties of his calling; for thus, if he shuns evils as sins, he daily does good, and is himself his own use in the common body. And so the common good is provided for as well as that of each individual,"—this gospel must come down and find its ultimatum in the personal lives of men. The ultimatum may be limited, it may be slow, but as far and as fast as it is effected it becomes a growing instrumentality through which the Lord can enable the world practically to realize the blessings due to the accomplishment of the last judgment and of His second and nearer coming to man.

There are other ways, as has been already indicated, in which we are to cooperate with the Lord's providence and aid in bringing His beneficent rule down into this world and in furthering human preparation for the more complete realization of that rule in the spiritual world. But all these efforts must find their real and full expression in this life of Christian charity, this life of definite and faithful service in some field of use. Herein do we make possible that for which we ask in the petition, "Thy will be done, as in heaven so also upon the earth"; and herein do we contribute our little, but vitally essential, part toward providing an orderly basis, into which the Lord can operate for the better accomplishment of His wise and gracious purposes.

W. H. M.

THE DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE NEW-CHURCH IDEA OF GOD.

THE distinctiveness of the New-Church idea of God is due to the Doctrine of Love revealed through Swedenborg. Love in the deepest and fullest sense is the very substance of the universe. It exists as wisdom and operates as use. These three, love, wisdom, and use are in essence God (Divine Love and Wisdom, 297). This doctrine is new, not merely in terms, but in the significance of each several term, and especially the term love. Love is not a property, it is the subject of all properties, the bearer, the source, the creator of all qualities and functions. It is an old adage that "love is blind," but this is true only in the sense that it is blind to all but its own object, which implies that it sees its object in its own light. In other words, love creates its object in the light of its own making. This is relatively true of human love, and it is absolutely true of the love which has the created universe for its object and out of which all things are made. The seeing of its object by love is the wisdom of love. Wisdom, therefore, is the self-representative function of love. In Swedenborg's terms, love exists in wisdom or as wisdom, and wisdom exists from love. In other words, wisdom is a name for one aspect or function of love. Use finally is the end or object which love sees, pursues, realizes. It is love's self-realizing function, attained through love's self-representation, wisdom, and embodies both the love and its wisdom. This form of life is exemplified in our human experience. It is the trinity which we variously style end, cause, effect; affection, thought, deed; will, understanding, act. This form into which our experience flows is the human form, and love in its full activity and expression is precisely this form. In other words, love is man and man is love. This is the new and distinctive doctrine of the New Church. And when we raise it to its highest powers we have the doctrine of the Divine Man stated in unique terms.

The doctrine of the Divine Man gets its distinctiveness from the foregoing doctrine of love. God is love, and love is God. But being love, God is also man, the Divine Man. Here again we must de-

velop a new point of view. The doctrine that God is man is familiar, but there are two points of view from which to think of God as man. We may begin with the ordinary idea of person and think of God as the Divine Man of infinite love, wisdom, and power, or we may think of love as the essence of man, and of person as the form and constitution of love. The former is the natural, familiar, historical way of thinking; the latter is the way of spiritual thought. In the words of Swedenborg, "Apocalypse Revealed," 611, "Every one who thinks of God from person only and not from essence, thinks materially. To think of His essence from His person is to think materially, but to think of His person from His essence is to think spiritually."

It does not, therefore, satisfy unequivocally the New-Church idea of God to think of Him as man. The idea of man must itself be a spiritual, not a natural or material idea. God's essence is love. Develop the idea of love to the complete form of human experience, and we express the result in the statement, love is man and man is love. With this idea of love and man we pass to infinite love and the Perfect Man, and think of love as God and God as man.

But for the New Church God is man, not only in this general spiritual sense, but also in the specific sense of being the man Jesus Christ glorified and made divine. This Divine Human is what the New Church means specifically by God-Man. Swedenborg enforces the spiritual point of view in "Arcana Coelestia," 4735:—

The Lord's Human, after it was glorified or made Divine, cannot be thought of as human (merely), but as Divine love in human form; and this more than the angels, who, when they appear, as they have been seen by me, are seen as forms of love and charity under the human shape, and this from the Lord; for the Lord from the Divine love made His Human Divine; just as man by heavenly love is made an angel after death, so that he appears, as just said, as a form of love and charity under the human shape. It is plain from this that by the Lord's Divine Human, in the celestial sense, is signified the Divine love itself, which is love towards the whole human race, in that it wishes to save them, and to make them blessed and happy forever, and to make its Divine their own as far as they can receive it.

This is a good example of thinking spiritually about man, angel, and the Lord.

L. F. H.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES.

WAS SWEDENBORG A FREE-MASON?

UNDER the title of "Swedenborg and Masonry" Mr. Edwin S. Crandon contributes a very carefully prepared and significant paper to the March number of *The New England Craftsman*, a Masonic periodical published in Boston, which gives a conclusive reply to this query. Mr. Crandon has made a thorough study of his subject, and the results are set before the reader in a clear and convincing way. An ardent Mason and at the same time an earnest New-churchman, he gathers the evidence pro and con, and, after an impartial examination, finds it overwhelmingly against the view that Swedenborg was a member of the Masonic order.

In explanation of the very common linking of the name of Swedenborg with Masonry he quotes "the painstaking, analytical, judicial Mackey," the author of the "Encyclopedia of Freemasonry," recognized as a standard authority among Masons:—

The . . . important basis on which the theory of a Swedenborgian Masonry has been built is the conduct of some of his own disciples, who imbued with his religious views, being Masons, carried the spirit of the New-Jerusalem doctrines into their Masonic speculations. There was, it is true, a Masonic rite, or system of Swedenborg, but its true history is this: The two most important religious works of Swedenborg, the "Arcana Cœlestia," and the "New Jerusalem," appeared, the former between the years of 1749 and 1753, and the latter in 1758. About that time we find Pernetty working out his schemes of Masonic reform. Pernetty was a theosophist, a Hermetic philosopher, a disciple to some extent of Jacob Böhme, the prince of Mystics. To such a man, the reveries, the visions and the spiritual speculations of Swedenborg were peculiarly attractive. He accepted them as an addition to the theosophic views which he had already received. About the year 1760 he established at Avignon his Rite of the Illuminati, in which the reveries of both Böhme and Swedenborg were introduced. In 1783 this system was reformed by the Marquis de Thome, another Swedenborgian, and out of that form arose what was called "the Rite of Swedenborg," not because Swedenborg had established it, or had anything directly to do with its establishment, but because it was based on his peculiar views, and because its symbolism was borrowed from the ideas he had advanced in the highly symbolical works that he had written.

Summing up the whole case, Mr. Crandon concludes his valuable article as follows:—

Thus we have New-Church and Masonic authority of the highest, distinctly disproving a mistaken, fanciful, imaginative claim, the persistence of which is one of the remarkable phases of our whole Masonic history, but which is not difficult to understand by the reader interested enough to read the summary which has been given above, imperfect and necessarily brief, yet perhaps of interest to some of the increasingly large number of Masons who delight in studying its wondrously rich and varied historical literature. That Masons were quick to appreciate the grandeur of the great Swede's revelations, to apply, if but a little, his wondrous relations of things heard and seen in the spiritual world to the strengthening of their own symbolism, to draw so freely from him, is a tribute indeed: that he was not a member of the Order is of little importance; that he aided so materially in enriching Masonry is of the greatest interest. And our own Mackey's conclusion shall be mine: "If there were really a borrowing of one from the other . . . it was the Freemasons of the high degrees who borrowed from Swedenborg and not Swedenborg from them. And so, we cannot deny that he has, unwittingly, exercised a powerful influence on Masonry."

It should be added that apart from the main purpose of his paper, to set right the relation of Swedenborg and his teachings to Masonry, Mr. Crandon has performed a real service for his readers and for the New Church as well, in his very clear statements respecting the character of the Divine Word and the nature of correspondences, and the careful discrimination he makes between the vagaries of the mystics and theosophists attributed to Swedenborg because for a time they claimed to be his followers, and the rational and scriptural doctrines which he was commissioned to reveal to men as the foundation truths of a New Church.

To those who would enter into the subject more fully and intelligently we would recommend not only the full text of Mr. Crandon's interesting paper, but a series of extracts from Dr. Mackey's article in the "Encyclopedia of Freemasonry," which may be found in Volume XVI. of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine* (New Series), 1892, pp. 613-17. It was contributed by the Rev. Adolph Roeder.

W. H. M.

NOXIOUS ANIMALS APPARENTLY ANTECEDENT TO MAN.

[IN July, 1907, there appeared in the REVIEW an interesting article, bearing the above title, from the pen of our brother editor, the Rev. Samuel M. Warren, who has since passed to the spiritual world. Friendly comments upon the paper were soon after received from Mr. George E. Holman of England and were published in the editorial pages of the October issue with a brief reply from Mr. Warren. Later a personal letter came from Mr. Holman, more fully explaining his position and mentioning points upon which he hoped Mr. Warren would give his opinion either in the REVIEW or by direct reply. In responding to the request, Mr. Warren seems to have spoken of the usefulness of ultimately publishing the correspondence, and Mr. Holman in his reply leaves him in entire freedom to carry out the suggestion. This reply came a few days after Mr. Warren left us and was the means of bringing to light the previous letters, including a very carefully made copy of that of Mr. Warren which was found among his papers. Under these circumstances, we feel that in publishing the matter involved in this interesting correspondence we are but carrying out the purpose of our late associate editor, and in view of the simple spirit of truth-seeking that so evidently pervades the letters we have felt it better to print them just as they came to us.—EDITORS.]

LONDON, ENGLAND, 4th Nov., 1907.

THE REV. S. M. WARREN,

Care of NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

My dear Sir:—

I take the liberty of writing to you personally with reference to your courteous reply to my criticism in the October REVIEW of your paper in the preceding issue. In some respects I think you have misunderstood my remarks and I should like to assure you that I do not for a moment doubt that there is complete harmony between the Writings and the facts of science, the only difficulty being to see those facts in their true light.

There are, however, some additional points I should like to put before you for your consideration.

First, while I agree with you that it is most likely true that animal

species vary in the course of generations owing to changing influx, I would point out that your remark on page 605 of the REVIEW, that "it does not appear . . . that as organic forms, evil uses could in any case be created *de novo* from the hells" is negatived by the express teaching in "Divine Love and Wisdom," 341, 342, and 343.

Secondly, the argument that "geology has not a particle of evidence that these ancient crocodiles would have had the evil disposition towards man which characterizes their vicious descendants in the present evil age" seems to me weak. It might equally be said that we have no evidence that they were other than evil. There are poisonous and non-poisonous serpents, but they can be distinguished by their appearance, and there are now harmless relations of the crocodile, (namely, gavials) as well as true crocodiles, and these gavials existed in cretaceous times as well as crocodiles. The plain and unstrained teaching of the Writings is that *all* crocodiles (namely, true crocodiles) are forms of evil, and it seems to me that we are unwarranted in making an exception in behalf of extinct crocodiles simply because our theories of geological succession do not fit in with the Writings. In the same way all dragons are said to be evil forms, yet the present-day draco is surely a very inoffensive creature compared to the real dragons of the secondary rocks, all of which are extinct, and are generally supposed to have become extinct before the creation of man.

Again, if a naturalist were asked to name the most terrible of all beasts that, so far as is known, ever existed on the earth, he would probably mention the sabre-toothed tiger (*machaerodus*) whose remains are found in Miocene deposits. Yet most geologists believe that man was created much later than the sabre-toothed tiger. Ought not the most terrible of all animals to have been contemporaneous with the greatest human evils?

Although it is of course admitted that, as regards extinct species we are quite unable to judge directly of their habits, still, why should we assume that the plain inference, drawn from the structure of very many extinct species in all stages of geological history (namely, that those species are forms of evil) is erroneous?

Thirdly, you say that the divine book of nature is very plainly written, and you are evidently referring to the succession of species. Is it not possible that this book may have been grossly misinterpreted even where it looks plainest? If we concede that the orthodox

version of geological history is true, we are met with this further difficulty: that since the creation of man on the earth (according to geologists, in Pleistocene or, possibly, Pliocene times) there has been practically no change in the fauna and flora of the globe as a whole, whereas we know from revelation that the human race has undergone very radical changes, and the doctrine of correspondence leads us to expect equivalent changesⁿ in the animal and vegetable kingdoms.

Personally, I have formed the conclusion that in the Word and the Writings we have a guide to a new systematic geology or history, of life on the earth; but what I am chiefly concerned about is to frame a satisfactory reply to criticisms of the Writings from the geological standpoint, and notwithstanding your full explanation I am sorry to say I am still unsatisfied that the orthodox version of geological history is in harmony with revelation.

If after considering the points I mention in this letter, you should find time to give me your opinion thereon, either by letter or in the REVIEW (if you think that course preferable) I should feel grateful.

I remain, Dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

GEO. E. HOLMAN.

JAN. 20, 1908.

My dear Mr. Holman:—

Your very interesting letter of the 4th November was duly received, and I should have been glad to respond to it before this but circumstances prevented. Pray excuse the delay.

I do not wish to be over confident that I have come to the right conclusion on all, or any, of the points of this difficult subject. I am not quite sure that I may not have felt over-confident. At any rate I wish to keep my mind entirely open to any light of truth that may be presented. It is a subject over some points of which, by the very nature of the case, we cannot have certain knowledge except by revelation. And with me it is a postulate that what is contained in the Writings on the subject is true, *if truly understood*. I have no doubt that it is so likewise with you. And it follows that the facts of nature, actually known, and *truly understood*, will be found in

harmony with this teaching. The converse, of course, also follows,—that if apparent facts are not in harmony with it, either they are not facts, or they are not fully and rightly understood.

The facts hitherto discovered and systematized in what is called the science of geology, have, in general, seemed to me in harmony with and confirmatory of what is taught in the Writings, to a remarkable degree. Possibly they are less perfectly so, as they are arranged and interpreted, than I have thought. If that is the case I shall be very glad to see them so corrected, or placed in such a light, that they will better harmonize with the Writings.

I was mistaken in my inference, on page 405 of the REVIEW, that "It does not appear consistent with this teaching [of the Writings] that, as organic forms, evil uses could in any case be created *de novo* from the hells." I had been familiar with the passages in "Divine Love and Wisdom" which you refer to, where the contrary is distinctly taught, but at the time of writing they did not come to my mind. There indeed is no such appearance of inconsistency as I thought, when the matter is more perfectly considered. Nor, rightly considered, does the fact of such creations *de novo* militate at all against the teaching that had been cited. Such organic forms, even when created *de novo* from the hells, cannot but be forms of perverted goods, and thus not of Divine creation as evil uses, but created through man's perversion, from the hells.

As to your remark upon "the argument 'that Geology has not a particle of evidence that the ancient crocodiles could have had the evil disposition towards man which characterizes their vicious descendants in the present evil age'"—that "it might equally be said that we have no evidence that they were other than evil"—I think your remark is perfectly true. There is no such external evidence. But the argument does not rest on external evidence; and therefore its apparent "weakness" is not real. Upon the ground of appearances alone the animals would be accounted evil uses—as they always have been. But it is entirely a matter of inference. There is no actual proof of their character on either side—and cannot be; and the outward appearances I confess, are against my argument,—and against the Writings, as to almost the whole body of paleozoic animals. But the universe, as you know, is full of proofs that the most convincing appearances often conceal, and sometimes contradict the real truth.

In this case we have, as I think, on one side the clear voice of revelation; and on the other side we have, and can have, only the evidence of external appearances. As I understand the Writings (and I think they are clear) they teach that all the lower forms of animal life, whether extinct or extant, are representative of uses in man, so low and yet necessary to his being, and there—therefore good uses—so low that, in themselves, apart from his higher manhood, they are evil,—because, in themselves, they look and tend downwards, away from the Lord; and, whether perverted or unperverted, they therefore are of evil appearance. And when perverted their appearance does not greatly change. Hence the statement (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 164, 154) “The *proprium* of man [in itself] is nothing but evil; and when presented to view is most hideous.”

Even the sabre-toothed tiger to which you refer as an extreme example, must have been representative of something in man’s *proprium* in itself evil, but capable of being made obedient and subservient to his higher manhood. Its hideous fangs, in the low order of its use, were perhaps but the necessary implements for the seizure and appropriation of such other animals as had been designed for its proper food, and so not out of Divine order in the scale of creation. The outward appearance alone cannot certainly be taken as conclusive evidence to the contrary. There is nothing in man’s *proprium*, as he was created, that may not be turned into obedience and service to the higher man. Conspicuous examples are given in the Word, and in the Writings, of such subserviency, and thence of the good correspondence, of even ferocious and predacious animals—the lion, the eagle, and even the wolf. In exposition of the clause in GEN. xlix. 27, “*Benjamin is a wolf*,” it is said (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 6441), “By a wolf is signified impetuosity in seizing and liberating the good. . . . It is similar with the signification of the wolf as with that of the lion, which also is a rapacious animal . . . and yet in a good sense the lion signifies truth in its might from good. . . . So with other rapacious beasts, as leopards, and eagles.”

The teaching of the Writings on this subject appears to me very clear. And I think the general conclusion to which the scientific world has come, from the facts of geology thus far discovered, as to the successive order of creation from the lowest upwards, is undoubtedly true, because it is not only rational, but is so clearly and completely substantiated by revelation, whatever modifications of their theories may hereafter be made by future discoveries.

The chief aim of my argument has been, to show from all the accumulated facts it possesses, geology has no authoritative evidence that Swedenborg's statement, that evil uses did not exist until after the fall of man, is not strictly true—as it is also obviously rational, and, apart from outward evidence, inherently probable.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL M. WARREN.

P.S. I find, on re-reading your letter, that there are some points which I have inadvertantly failed to touch upon: First, you say: "The plain and unstrained teaching of the Writings is, that *all* crocodiles, namely true crocodiles, are forms of evil; and it seems to me that we are unwarranted in making an exception in behalf of extinct crocodiles" etc.

To this I would reply: That the facts of science were not subjects of revelation to Swedenborg, and there is no reason to believe that he knew of the existence of the remains of paleozoic crocodiles or that there had been such. In his day very few of the facts of geology had been discovered, and, if I mistake not, this fact had not been. Consequently Swedenborg only spoke of the crocodiles that were extant, which he knew of, and which were noxious to men. Because these are noxious, it does not follow that their ancient progenitors were so.

In like manner he did not know of the paleozoic dragons, but probably had in mind the vicious dragons of tradition, whose counterparts he had seen in the spiritual world.

Second, you say: "We are met with the further difficulty: that since the creation of man on the earth . . . there has been practically no change in the fauna and flora of the globe as a whole, whereas we know from revelation that the human race has undergone very radical changes, and the doctrine of correspondence leads us to expect equivalent changes in the animal and vegetable kingdom."

It is exactly accordant with the doctrine laid down in the Writings, that there has been no such change in the fauna and flora of the globe since man was created. In "Last Judgment," 9, we are taught that the creation of the universe was completed before man was created. That "man was the last thing created. . . . Creation began from the inmost, that is from the Divine, and went forth to the ex-

tremes, or ultimates, and there first subsisted. The ultimate is the natural universe, and in the terraqueous globe, and all things thereon. When these were completed literally, gone through with, [*peracta sunt*] then man was created," etc. But, though the whole order of creation has been gone through with, yet there have been very great changes—"radical" changes—by perversion of the quality of things created, correspondent and equivalent to the radical changes in man.

It appears to me very probable that, as you suggest, through further discoveries of facts, and with the advancing light of the new revelation, there will be very great modifications and changes of theory respecting the history of life upon the earth. Especially must there be as to the perpetual, living, and active omnipresence of the Divine Creator, operating in all the works of His creation, great and small.

As it is, we can hardly expect that any reply we may make to the criticisms of those who think the created world a great machine left to run itself—who do not acknowledge the omnipresence of a perpetual active Creator and a living sentient spiritual world through which the Creator acts as the world of causes within this natural world of effects—we can hardly expect that any reply we may make to such will be accepted as satisfactory. The most we can hope to do is to shift the logical burden of proof to their side; and this, I think, our argument rationally does.

S. M. W.

LONDON, ENGLAND, 16 Feb. 1908.

Dear Mr. Warren:—

I am very much obliged to you for your interesting letter of the 20th of January, and as to publishing our correspondence (or any part of it) in the REVIEW, please do exactly as you think fit. But I have still some points to put before you, and I have delayed replying to your letter in order to weigh well all your arguments. You will think me rather stubborn, but I am still unconvinced that you are right.

Let me say first of all that I heartily agree with your position that "what is contained in the Writings on the subject is true *if truly*

understood," but there are two references to the Writings made in your letter on which I think a different construction might be put and should be put. You quote "Arcana Cœlestia," 164 and 154, that "the proprium of man itself is nothing but evil." Does not this mean perverted proprium?

Again you say that ferocious animals have a good representation at times in the Word and in the Writings, and you quote GEN. xlix. 27. "Benjamin is a wolf" and "Arcana Cœlestia," 6441, "By a wolf is meant impetuosity in seizing and liberating good," etc. Now I would suggest that there is a difference between representation and true correspondence. While wolves, etc., may be used to represent good affections, I do not think they can be said to correspond to them in the strict sense of the term. In the writing of the Word the Divine Truth necessarily clothed itself with images already existing in the memories of the human instruments, and I take it that the animals, etc., really corresponding to the affections to be expressed were often unknown to the writers. They did not exist in their memories and therefore could not be used in the letter of the Word. Possibly (if not probably) the pure correspondent of the good affection was extinct—at any rate it was unknown and therefore had to be substituted by an evil or mixed animal, which then only represented the good affection (in the same manner as a bad man is used to represent the Lord).

So far, to clear the ground.

Now an important argument occurs to me, and it is this: If your view were correct and the extinct species of dragons and crocodiles in secondary rocks, and scorpions, etc., in carboniferous rocks, were not in reality embodiments of evil, like the present-day forms, but embodiments of good, why is it that in the spiritual world no such things were seen in the heavens but only in the hells. It is evident from "Athanasian Creed," 89, and "True Christian Religion," 78, that tigers, wolves, and crocodiles are not in heaven, and indeed we cannot imagine them there, though if it were possible for good affections to take that external form it is certain they would be there, and Swedenborg would have seen them, and would not have made the sharp distinction which he did.

I think "Last Judgment," 9, is equally applicable to a theory which I hinted at in the last paragraph of my letter in the October REVIEW, and which if you have a file of *Morning Light* at

hand I should be glad to have your opinion upon. It is a paper by me in *Morning Light* for May 12 and 19, 1906; and in the June, 1900, number of *New-Church Life* I gave an outline of the same idea. When you have time to look at either of these I should be glad if you would do so. At the same time, I do not want it to be thought that I am egotistical. I would very much rather accept your view, which does not conflict with accepted theories of science, if I could; but it seems to me that it does conflict with revelation.

I hope I am not trespassing too much on your valuable time. I know you are very busy, but I assume you are as interested in this subject as myself. Please however do not feel bound to reply to this letter until you have leisure to do so.

Again thanking you for your letter,

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

GEO. E. HOLMAN.

SWEDENBORG'S TERMS RELATING TO MARRIAGE.

I. CONJUGIALE.

THIS term is used by Swedenborg to express the marriage relation of good and truth in and from the Lord, and also the effort, tendency, and inclination of good and truth to unite together. It also describes a similar tendency in the will and understanding, and thence also in the male and female sexes, and even in the kingdoms of nature.

In its most universal sense this *conjugiale* affects not only men, but all living things, as may be seen from the following:—

The *conjugiale* of good and truth by creation is implanted in the soul of everyone, and also in the sequences from the soul; for that *conjugiale* fills the universe from firsts to ultimates, and from man even to worms. (*Conjugial Love*, 204.)

The *conjugiale* of feminine and masculine is implanted from creation in animals, and also in the vegetative and in the animal soul, and that otherwise the world would cease to be. (Index II to *Sap. Angelica de Conjugio* (post.), p. 53. See also p. 54, and *Arcana Cœlestia*, 2727, 2759.)

The *conjugiale* is represented in the kingdoms of nature everywhere, as from the transformation of caterpillars into nymphs and chrysalises, and thus into flying things. (*De Conjugio*, p. 28.)

The origin of the conjugiale.

The *conjugiale* derives its origin from the marriage of good and truth in the Lord. Thus we read:—

The *conjugiale* in the supreme sense is the union of the Divine and the Divine Human in the Lord; thence it is the union of the Divine good and the Divine truth in heaven, for what proceeds from the Lord is Divine truth from Divine good, thence heaven is heaven, and is called a marriage (*conjugium*) . . . For good and truth make a marriage, and their conjunction is meant by the *conjugiale*; thence it is manifest how sacred a thing it was to be bound by the *conjugiale*, which was signified by placing the hand under the thigh. (Arcana Cœlestia, 6179.)

Again we read of the effects produced in men and in the universe by this marriage of good and truth in the Lord:—

From the influx of the marriage of good and truth from the Lord, there is the love of sex, and there is marriage love. . . . A universal marriage sphere proceeds from the Lord, and pervades the universe from first things to last, thus from angels even to worms. (Conjugal Love, 92.)

This sphere flowing into its subjects, both men and animals, produces this universal inclination to conjunction into one which is designated by the term *conjugiale*. Its reception, however, is according to the form. It is human with men and angels, but merely natural in the subjects of the animal and vegetable kingdoms. Thus we read:—

What genuine marriage love is and whence its origin few at this day know, because few are in it. Almost all believe that it is innate, and thus flows forth from a certain natural instinct as they say, and this the more because the *conjugiale* also exists with animals; when nevertheless there is such a difference between the marriage love with men, and the *conjugiale* with animals as there is between the state of man, and the state of brute animals. (Arcana Cœlestia, 2727.)

The conjugiale with men.

The *conjugiale* is inscribed on each sex from inmosts to outmosts. (Conjugal Love, 140.)

The *conjugiale* is in the whole and in every part of man, but it is different in the male from that in the female. (Index II to *Sap. Angelica de Conjugio* (post.), p. 54.)

This conjugiale is internal and external.

In every man from creation and therefore by birth there is implanted an *internal conjugiale* and an *external conjugiale*; the internal is spiritual, and the external is natural. Man comes first into the external, and as he becomes spiritual he comes into the internal. If therefore he remains in the *external* or *natural conjugiale*, the *internal* or *spiritual conjugiale* is veiled over, even until he knows nothing of it, yea, until he calls it an empty conceit. But if a man becomes spiritual he begins to know something of it, after that to have some perception of its quality; and gradually, to feel its pleasantness, its delights, and its exquisite enjoyments. And as these are experienced the veil above mentioned between the internal and the external begins to grow thin, then as it were to melt away, and finally to dissolve and disappear. When this has come to pass the *external conjugiale* still remains, but is continually purged and purified of its dross by the internal; and this until the external becomes as the face of the internal, and derives its delight and at the same time its life, and the deliciousness of its potency, from the blessedness that is in the internal. Such is the renunciation of whoredoms, through which comes the chastity of marriage. (Conjugal Love, 148.)

From these statements it may be seen that there are degrees of the *conjugiale* corresponding with the degrees of the mind. In the internal mind, which corresponds with heaven, the *conjugiale* is of a quality similar to that of this mind, namely, it is spiritual. The *external conjugiale* is of a quality similar to that of the natural mind. As this mind is the seat of disorder and evil in man the *external conjugiale* is of a like quality. It is to be noted that every man, including the unregenerate, has both degrees of the mind from birth, and both degrees of the *conjugiale*; but the internal degree is not opened and developed except so far as man is regenerated. When he begins the work of regeneration the *external conjugiale* begins to be purified by the influx of the internal, but this purification takes place only so far as man renounces whoredoms. (See Conjugal Love, 148, end.)

The conjugiale with Christians.

The *conjugiale*, although it is with every man who is born, is of a different quality with Christians, because in its influx into the minds and lives of men, it is modified according to the principles of their religion. Thus we read:—

The Christian *conjugiale* alone is given chaste. . . . The chaste *conjugiale* is given only in the Christian world, and if it be not there it is yet possible there. By the Christian *conjugiale* is meant *the marriage of one man with one wife*. That this *conjugiale* can be implanted among Christians, and by inheritance descend to the offspring of parents who are in true marriage love, and that from this a faculty and an inclination for growing wise in the things of the church and of heaven may become connate, will be seen in its proper place. (*Conjugial Love*, 142.)

The *conjugiale* is inscribed on the interior minds of Christians, because they acknowledge the Lord and His Divine, and on their exterior minds by the civil laws. (*Ibid.*, 335, 338.)

The offspring . . . do not draw from the parents or inherit the affections themselves and thence the lives of those affections, but only the inclinations and also the faculties toward them. (*Ibid.*, 202.)

This inclination which they draw from the parents is called "the *conjugiale* of good and truth." (*Ibid.*, 202.)

This *conjugiale* passes from the soul even into the ultimates of the body . . . it is changed in the way, . . . sometimes into the opposite, which is called the *conjugale* or *connubiale* of evil and the false. . . . This is that *conjugiale* from which offspring draw the inclinations from parents, a son in one way, a daughter in another. (*Ibid.*, 203.)

The Christian *conjugiale* of one man with one wife is the jewel of human life, and the repository of the Christian religion. (*Ibid.*, 457, 458, 466, 531.)

It is to be noted here that this *conjugiale* with children is an inheritance from parents, as it were a seed, from which true marriage love may be developed. It is awakened into activity when the sex inclination manifests itself. (See *Ibid.*, 44.)

In heaven vernal heat opens their interiors even to the inmosts which are called their souls, and affects these, and inscribes its *conjugiale* on them. (*Ibid.*, 137.)

For other references on the *conjugiale* see "Conjugial Love," 64, 69, 80, 140, 142, 187, 188, 304, 316, 466; "Arcana Cœlestia," 2759, 3942, 3946, 3947, 3952, 3956, 4171, 4280, 4288, 4592 end, 4837, 4899, 4903, 5084⁷, 8994, 10756; "Apocalypse Explained," 995; *De Conjugio*, p. 6, 15, 28; Index I to *Sap. Angelica de Conjugio* (post.), pp. 13, 14, 24, 31, 32, 49; Index II, p. 54; "Spiritual Diary," 6110⁶⁶; the conjunctive inclination described in "Conjugial Love," 37, 38, is also meant by the *conjugiale*.

How the conjugiale is destroyed.

Because everyone possesses this *conjugiale* from creation and birth we must not assume that it is a regenerate state in man: it is only an inclination received from parents. It inflows into the soul from the Lord, and because of the possibilities which may develop from it as from a seed, it is the jewel of human life and the repository of the Christian religion. This *conjugiale* may also be perverted and even destroyed in the external mind and life, but the internal which is spiritual is then veiled over, the internal mind itself being then closed. How the *conjugiale* is veiled over and destroyed may be learned from the following statements:—

If he remains in the *external or natural conjugiale*, the *internal or spiritual conjugiale* is veiled over, even until he knows nothing of it, yea, until he calls it an empty conceit. (Conjugal Love, 148.)

This veiling over of the internal takes place when the love of the sex is active before marriage, and in sex relations contrary to marriage. (See Conjugal Love, 447, 460, 475.)

The *conjugiale* itself, however, which is veiled over and yet is not destroyed during the activities of evil states is not a regenerate condition, but is the implanted inclination from creation which can be developed into true marriage love provided man renounces whoredoms (148), and lives according to the true principles of marriage love, and devotes himself to one to whose soul he unites his own soul. (*Ibid.*, 447.)

The *conjugiale*, however, is destroyed by adulteries of various kinds, as by the lust of varieties (*Ibid.*, 510), by the lust of violation (512), by the lust of seducing innocences (513). See also n. 466; "Apocalypse Explained," 1010; *De Conjugio*, pp. 21, 29.

In those sexual evils, however, which are afterward repented of and removed, the *conjugiale* which is veiled over is not destroyed, for, were it destroyed, as is the case in the worst of those evils, the man could not be saved. See Conjugal Love, 449, 456, 459, 460, 475; "Spiritual Diary," 6054; "Apocalypse Explained," 1010.

Definitions of conjugiale.

In "Arcana Cœlestia," 6179, the *conjugiale* is defined in the supreme sense as the union of the Divine and the Divine Human of the Lord, thence the union of Divine good and Divine truth in heaven, also the conjunction of good and truth. An angel defined the *conjugiale* peculiar and proper to the Christian man as "the desire of living with only one wife" (Conjugal Love, 80). It is also defined as "the marriage of one man with one wife" (*Ibid.*, 142). The *conjugiale* of good and truth which Christian children draw from their parents is defined as an inclination and faculty to such things as are of the love and life of the parents (*Ibid.*, 202). See also *Ibid.*, 46-53; 63, 83-115, 137, 157, 160, 171, 246, 525.

Translation of conjugiale.

The term *conjugiale* is the neuter form of the adjective *conjugialis* used as an abstract noun to describe the state of marriage (1) of the Divine and Human in the Lord, (2) of good and truth in angels and men, (3) of one man and one woman, (4) of the states preliminary to that marriage, or the inclinations to it, (5) of the inclination of the masculine and the feminine toward each other in man and in the animal kingdom.

This term has been translated conjugal principle by the early translators. In the Rotch edition of "Conjugal Love" just published it is translated desire for marriage and marriage desire, following the definition of the angel quoted above. The Rotch edition of the "Arcana Cœlestia" translates it marriage relation, marriage desire (3942, 3946). Potts' Concordance renders it conjugal, or the conjugal. The term, no doubt, has a wide range of meaning expressing the idea of that which pertains to the marriage relation as to good and truth, as to the masculine and feminine, and as to the sex relation in general throughout nature. The implanted inclination to conjunction is also expressed by this word. The old term *conjugial principle* is stilted and is not now favored. Mr. Potts' rendering is not so much a translation as a transferring of the Latin word into English. The word conjugal as a noun is not yet recognized as an English word. The translations marriage desire, marriage relation, and marriage

inclination express the sense in English. It seems preferable in making a translation to express the sense in English words if possible. No doubt several expressions may be needed to embody the varied meanings of the original, but we fully endorse the translation of the Rotch edition as giving a clearer idea to the English reader than the term the conjugal, or the conjugal principle.

2. CONJUGALE.

This word occurs only once in the writings of Swedenborg, and is evidently a misprint, the *i* being omitted. It is found in "Conjugal Love," 203, where we read of the *conjugiale* being turned into the opposite: "Which is called the *conjugale* or *connubiale* of evil and the false"; and it proceeds to speak of both, saying, "It is this and that *conjugiale* from which offspring draw inclinations from parents."

The word *conjugalis* occurs four times in the writings of Swedenborg, but in these places it is evident that the printer has omitted the letter *i*, as Rev. S. M. Warren has shown in previous articles in THE REVIEW. In the case above quoted, the fact that Swedenborg refers to the previous instance by the word *conjugiale* shows that he did not intend to make a distinction between the words *conjugiale* and *conjugale*.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

THE LIBRARY EDITION OF THE "DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM," AND OF THE "DIVINE PROVIDENCE."*

WE very cordially welcome the appearance of these two companion volumes in the excellent and attractive "Library Edition" of the works of Swedenborg. The translating and editing in each case seems to have been done by the Rev. John C. Ager, but from the "Translator's Note," which prefaces the "Divine Love and Wisdom," we learn that the text of this work has undergone a special revision. "In this revision," Mr. Ager tells us, "the translator has had the valuable assistance of suggestions by the Rev. L. H. Tafel and others." But he adds, "the new renderings of *existere* [taking form] and *fugere* [to flee from, instead of to shun] are suggestions adopted by the Editorial Committee and accepted by the translator, but for which he does not wish to be held solely responsible."

To each of the volumes is appended quite a full "Index of Words," which impresses us as of exceptional value in that it very largely combines definitions of terms with the usual references to passages.

The pocket, or "handy-volume" edition of the revised "Divine Love and Wisdom" is, as to type, paper, and binding, a model of its kind.

MANUAL FOR SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.†

OUR English brethren of the Sunday-School Union have issued for the third year their Teachers' Manual. It is upon the same plan as that described in the REVIEW last year. The work of compilation

**Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom.*

Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Providence. By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. Library Edition. New York: The American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society, 3 West Twenty-Ninth Street. 1908. Price, \$1.00 each.

Pocket Edition of "Divine Love and Wisdom." Price, 35 cents.

† *Manual for New-Church Sunday-School Teachers*, 1907-1908. Manchester, England. 1907. 275 pp. 12mo. Illustrated.

has been committed to the same hands. The section on Judges and the Special Festival Lesson has been prepared by the Rev. J. Ashby; the sections on Matthew and I Samuel, by the Rev. S. J. C. Goldsack; the section on Luke, and the Notes on the Correspondences, by the Rev. W. H. Buss. Mr. Ashby has also prepared notes on the "New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine," and on the memory work.

The Manual is intended for the use of teachers only, and they are advised to read all the notes in preparation for their lessons of no matter what grade. Hence the grading of the English Sunday-schools does not appear in these notes. But it is evident from the Syllabus printed at the beginning of the volume that all the grades have the same Bible lesson each Sunday, and the difference is largely in the way in which it is taught in each grade, as the case has been in our *Sower* notes recently. The teacher is left to make the application to his class as best he can. But in addition to the Bible lessons, in the first and second grades, the correspondence of walking, standing, sitting, tree, leaf, fruit, chaff, and wind is to be taught during the year. In the third grade attention is to be given to historical, geographical, and other facts, and spiritual instruction is added concerning the Lord's resurrection appearances; also the doctrine of love in general, and the love of self and the love of the world. In the fourth grade, the same spiritual instruction concerning the Lord's resurrection is given, but considerably extended. The doctrinal study is extended also to include the love of the neighbor, or charity. In all the grades the Conference Catechism is to be committed to memory and verses from Scripture, but different portions in different grades.

The ground covered in the year's work is very much less than that attempted in this country, and when we remember that the schools continue their lessons through the summer without interruption we wonder that more is not undertaken. The thought of using different portions of the Word for children of different ages, or grades, which we are now considering, seems not to have been adopted. Indeed, the plan seems to be not to attempt to cover all the Scriptures and the doctrines, but by selecting the most prominent lessons of the Word and the cardinal doctrines, to give a good grounding in the essentials of religion and of the church during a child's connection with the school. Thus the Old Testament lessons for the year include only

thirteen chapters, five from Judges and eight from I Samuel; and the New Testament lessons, three from Matthew and six from Luke: those from Matthew relating to the Lord's death and resurrection; those from Luke, to His birth, childhood, baptism, and the beginning of His ministry. The year is divided into four quarters, and the lessons change each quarter from one Testament to the other. The year is divided by an examination, March 1. So both Old and New Testament lessons are equally included in this examination. Reviews are also provided at the end of each quarter. Suggestions for the use of the blackboard are frequent. The pictures seem to have been more carefully selected than those of last year, although we are led to doubt if the tabernacle had a high-pitched roof, as pictured; and the tents around it look more like the wigwams of American Indians than the tents of the Orient. The Jews also seem to be within Pilate's palace when he washes his hands of the Lord's innocent blood, while we are expressly taught that they would not enter it lest they be defiled and prevented from eating the pass-over (JOHN xviii. 28). But we know how hard it is to find pictures that are free from objections.

A NEW COMMENTARY UPON JOHN.*

WHEN the first of this series of commentaries upon the Divine Word was issued,—the volume devoted to the gospel of Matthew,—we spoke at length of the importance of the enterprise, and dwelt upon the thoroughness with which the editors had done their work. The appearance of the second volume of the series, after the lapse of a little more than a year, would seem to require little else than words of general and emphatic approval of the ongoing work, coupled with the most distinct recognition of the intrinsic and exceptional value of the work itself. For the bringing of Swedenborg's scattered expositions of the deep and true meaning of the Word into immediate juxtaposition with the passages which they illustrate must be viewed as only second to that of making his writings available in good English translations.

We are glad to learn that the compilers have in preparation a

**Commentary on the Gospel according to John.* Compiled from the Theological Works of Emanuel Swedenborg. By ROBERT S. FISCHER and LOUIS G. HOECK. Boston: Published for the Rotch Trustees by the Massachusetts New-Church Union. 1908. Price, \$1.25.

similar commentary upon the Book of Psalms, and we trust the series may go on until all the books of the Word, not continuously explained by Swedenborg, shall be included in it.

AN ESSAY ON THE MEMORABLE RELATIONS.*

IN this brief essay of ten pages Mr. Barler gives a very simple statement of what the "Memorable Relations" are, where they are to be found, and Swedenborg's use of them.

There can be no question that the "Memorable Relations" form a unique and valuable part of Swedenborg's writings, and Mr. Barler's highly appreciative estimate of them is fully justified. As he suggests, the disposition to apologize for these wonderful testimonies, and to wish them out of the way, is an altogether mistaken attitude. They are, indeed, the matter of fact basis of our belief in the other world and of our knowledge of it. Without them we should have only abstract statements of doctrine which, however enlightening, would still lack the evidence of actual experience.

Swedenborg foresaw how his *Memorabilia* would be received. He says "True Christian Religion," 851:—

I foresee that many who read these *Memorabilia* annexed to each chapter of this work will believe them to be fictions of the imagination; but I protest in truth that they are not fictions, but were really seen and heard; not seen and heard in any state of mind in sleep, but in a state of complete wakefulness.

Those who rush to the conclusion that these accounts of things seen and heard are *ipso facto* proof of delusion and of visionary mental aberration, should consider the judicial calmness of these narratives, and especially Swedenborg's perfect self-composure and self-mastery. Mental pathologists like Ireland and Ballet, who have classed him with paranoiacs need to be reminded that Swedenborg was himself in the highest degree an expert in his understanding and portrayal of psychopathic conditions. Such students have much to learn from Swedenborg's contributions to their science. However strange his accounts sometimes seem, we must not forget that we are dealing with expert testimony. It is safe to predict that these *Memorabilia* will be more and more studied by scientific psychologists, and that their value will become more and more appreciated with the progress of knowledge in this field.

**An Essay on the Memorable Relations.* A Companion to "Degrees of Life in Man." By O. L. BARLER. Chicago: Saul Brothers, Printers. 1908. Price, 15 cents.

Mr. Barler has well summarized the practical religious value of the "Memorable Relations," and the summary is worth reproducing in substance. To quote:—

I. There must be knowledge and experience gathered from things heard and seen in the spiritual world to show that man after death is just as much a man as before.

"That man may no longer remain in a fallacious idea respecting spirits and angels and his own soul after death, it has pleased the Lord to open the sight of my spirit and to permit me to converse face to face with angels and with men who have died, and to observe them and to touch them, and to say many things about the unbelief of men who are still living. With these I have had daily association from the year 1744 to the present time, 1763, a period of nineteen years, from all of which it can be seen that the spirit of man is equally man after death." (Divine Wisdom, vii. 1.)

II. There must be knowledge and experience gathered from things heard and seen in the spiritual world to show the difference between what is spiritual and what is natural.

"The distinction and difference between what is spiritual and what is natural can be known only to one who has been in both worlds and who can change from one to the other, and be at one time in one world and at another in the other, and by turning back can look at one from the other. This privilege has been granted to me whereby I have learned what the natural man is and what the spiritual man is." (*Ibid.*, vii. 5.)

This is continued to the number of six specifications. It is an effective way of illustrating the importance of the "Memorable Relations," and it might be carried on to much greater length with telling effect.

In the following sentence Mr. Barler uses the word *copies* in a way that is misleading. "In the spiritual world it is manifest that spirits and angels are environed with scenery and created forms that are *copies* of the inner affections and thoughts of the inhabitants there."

The external objects in the spiritual world are not *copies* of the internal states of the angels, but *representatives* of them.

It may be well to remark here that the relation of outward representative to the internal state represented is one of the deepest and most mysterious of all the relations in experience, but it only misleads to substitute the word copy for representative or correspondent. Sound corresponds to affection, but the sound is not a copy of the affection represented. As a mere question of the use of words this is not an important matter, but Swedenborg's doctrine of represen-

tation is fundamental. It should receive the most thoroughgoing investigation and exposition.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Barler will continue his labors in the direction of showing the use and importance of the "Memorable Relations." It is a task which the church will have to grow up to by systematic effort.

MARRIAGE LOVE.*

THIS little book, sent to the REVIEW from England because its last and best chapter is entitled "Conjugal Love," and quotes considerably from Swedenborg, is of interest to us on that account. The author appears to be but little read in the writings of Swedenborg, and quite misrepresents his meaning. But perhaps the Preface should prepare us for this, since in it we read:—

To every author quoted I owe thanks and gratitude. But among the living I would name especially Leo Tolstoy and Mary Everest Boole. I do not wish to be misunderstood here, as attributing any deduction I may have drawn from their writings, and those of others, to them. Whether either of them would agree with my conclusions I do not know.

The book pretends to be nothing but the reprint of notes, scribbled in the margins of books consulted while seeking a solution to my own doubts and difficulties.

Swedenborg is treated most respectfully as "a great practical scientist as well as mystic." And the manifest intention of the author is to honor his views and cite him as an eminent authority in support of his own. But his own are unconsciously, it appears, diametrically the opposite of Swedenborg's teachings. For instance, in the first chapter on "What is Love?" he concludes that love is a means to an end; an attraction and a feeling of good will, the leader to a goal, in nature intermediate between Divine and human, in itself neither good nor evil; while every student of Swedenborg knows that he teaches that love is life itself, and in its origin is God Himself, for love is the *esse* and wisdom the *existere* of the Divine Being.

It is remarkable that this escaped the author's notice, for in the last chapter we read:—

Swedenborg teaches that the union of the sexes symbolizes the union of the Divine Love and Wisdom; that woman is the channel through which man

**Love: Sacred and Profane.* By F. E. WORLAND. London: C. W. Daniel. 1907. 16mo. cloth. 167 pp.

comes to the full apprehension of the Divine Love; and that only through man can woman realize to the full the Divine Wisdom. (p. 147.)

One would think after this that he would see some deeper objection to free love than that "monogamy tends to decrease the temptations to physical pleasure by making it less alluring." (p. 139.)

This reveals the chief characteristic of the book, namely, that chastity and purity are to be sought by refraining as much as possible from the physical relations of marriage, and turning the sex-power from the procreation of the race to the higher development of self (individuation). (p. 132 *et ubique*.)

* In support of this view an extract is cited from a "Memorable Relation" as follows:—

The love of a man and a woman is the love of the understanding and its affection, and this love enters deeply and effects conjunction, which is that love; but the conjunction of minds and not at the same time of bodies, or the endeavor towards that conjunction alone, is spiritual love, and consequently chaste love. (p. 150.)

But here good spirits are speaking, not of marriage love, but of the chaste love of the sex—between those who are not husband and wife. Hence we read on:—

And this love they alone have who are in true marriage love; and from this they are in eminent potency, because by reason of their chastity they do not admit influx of love from the body of any other woman than their own wives; and being in super-eminent potency they cannot but love the sex and at the same time turn with loathing from unchastity. Thence have they a chaste love of the sex which in itself regarded is an interior spiritual friendship, that derives its sweetness from eminent but chaste potency. (Conjugal Love, 55.)

Swedenborg's definition of chastity is never that of refraining from the bodily relations of marriage, — as our friend ought to see, for in the next paragraph he quotes from the same book: "All the delights of conjugal love, even the ultimate ones, are chaste," — but chastity is in shunning adulteries as sins against the Lord, and in loving one wife.

We will call attention to only one other misunderstanding of Swedenborg. In speaking of conjugal love as exceedingly rare he says:

This love, so Swedenborg tells us, is often experienced by lovers during their betrothal and the first few days of marriage, but, afterwards, in the majority of cases flees away. (p. 151.)

But when we read through the paragraph cited we find that this *frequent* experience of young lovers is not the exceedingly *rare* conjugal love itself, but only something that "emulates" it, "and presents it to view in a certain image" (Conjugal Love, 58). For "none can be in this love but those who approach the Lord, and love the truths of the church, and practise its goods." (p. 149.)

AN OPEN LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.*

THE struggle between the democracy in France and the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the church of Rome has been a more or less constant feature of French politics since the time of the bloody "Revolution." This struggle, growing in intensity, reached a crisis in the passage of two laws; the law of "Associations" (1901) and the law of "Separation" (1905); the one authorizing the formation of religious associations, the other proclaiming the separation of church and state. Naturally these laws operated against the special privileges of the church and were strenuously opposed. The principle involved in both cases was no doubt on the side of abstract justice and democratic freedom, but it would be rash for an outsider to pass judgment on the merits of the struggle in the concrete. The complications in a case like this are inevitably very great, and the immediate issues are more or less obscured and concealed.

On Dec. 14, 1906, Cardinal Gibbons, in an interview published in the *Baltimore Sun*, severely arraigned the French government, charging that the leaders were actuated by hatred of religion, and that the acts of the government ignored property rights and the constitution of the church.

This "Open Letter" is the answer Paul Sabatier, widely known for his "Life of Saint Francis of Assisi," makes to these charges. In a neat little volume of eighty-eight pages, containing besides the "Letter," an address to the reader, a reprint of the "Interview," and some pages of notes at the end, Sabatier undertakes to refute *seriatim* every count made in the "Interview." As a direct refutation the "Letter" does not strike one as successful. There are flat denials and counter charges in abundance, but of straightforward conclusive statement on the points at issue there is comparatively little. The

**An Open Letter to His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons.* Apropos of his interview on the Separation of Church and State in France. By PAUL SABATIER. Translated by John Richard Slattery. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. 1908. 88 pp. Price, 60 cents.

loudly professed sentiment of the reply is that of a respectful protest against Cardinal Gibbons' misunderstanding of the situation, ascribed to misinformation; but the frequent side thrusts and counter charges reveal the animus of a zealous partisan and opponent. The two men, in fact, look at the situation from different points of view, and emphasize different aspects of it.

Sabatier denies flatly that hatred of religion or violation of law and property rights are at all involved in the present action of the French government separating church and state. He declares that the main body of the clergy even are in favor of giving the law a fair trial. He throws all the blame on the "clericals," the party of the ecclesiastics and the hierarchy, who are inimical both to freedom and to democratic government.

Cardinal Gibbons naturally looks at the situation from the point of view of the organized church, and as is also natural, is inclined to identify religion and the church, so that hostility to ecclesiastics and to the ecclesiastical system appears to him as hatred of religion. But apart from this form of begging the question, he is probably right in tracing much of the anti-ecclesiastical aggressiveness in France to hatred of religion as such. The spirit of the "French Revolution," and the spirit of revolutionary radicals generally, is notoriously irreligious. It may be true, as Sabatier maintains, that hatred of religion is not the controlling motive in the forces behind the French government; but that it has a considerable part to play, no one can doubt who has heard echoes of popular French literature. In spite of his protestations Sabatier himself at unguarded moments comes dangerously near falling in rank with the "Religion of Democracy," which has a suspicious kinship with the "Worship of Humanity."

On the whole it seems that as to this point Cardinal Gibbons is too sweeping, and Sabatier too much of a partisan, too evasive and rhetorical. It is mere quibbling, for instance, to say in refutation, that "it is not easy to understand how atheists can hate a God who in their eyes does not exist."

The "law of associations" guarantees the right of any body of persons to form a religious association in accordance with their form of church order. This, in certain cases, may endanger the existence of a Roman congregation and incur the loss of its property. The "law of separation" deprives the Roman ecclesiastical system of certain rights in government protection, support, and control, and so of a political handle.

Cardinal Gibbons' charges concern rather the execution of these laws and their practical consequences. Sabatier's rebuttal leads us to details political, legal, and ecclesiastical which only an expert could follow. It seems, however, that from his own point of view, Cardinal Gibbons is substantially correct. Sabatier urges, in effect, a different point of view and conflicting considerations rather than square contradictions. His arguments are not straightforward and candid statements of the simple elements of the situation, but are, for the most part, political moralizing more or less irrelevant. He is not convincing, nor does he throw much helpful light on the real issues. He does, however, give us glimpses into the condition of parties and of the interests at stake. He makes it appear that the French government, backed by a strong democratic sentiment and purpose, and the hierarchy, are engaged in a serious if not mortal conflict. It is a special instance of the historic struggle between "church and state," wherein just now the state has the upper hand. No doubt the interests of religion are involved, but probably neither party is the exclusive guardian of these interests.

In some form or other democracy seems inevitable. How far the Roman hierarchy can maintain itself in a thorough-going democracy time alone can decide. There seems to be no ground for apprehension that the church as the organic expression of religious life will fail to respond to democratic needs. From this point of view the struggle now going on in France is of general interest, and the little book before us will no doubt stimulate that interest. The translation of it should be revised and improved.

THE NEW THEOLOGY AND THE TRUE COMPARED.*

THE "New Theology," so-called, is the same in its tendencies and general form of thought on both sides of the Atlantic and the world over. It dwells so much upon the immanence of God, and so little upon His eminence, as to largely identify nature and man with the Creator, and to lose sight of the difference between the Divine Human nature of the Lord Jesus and other human natures; it exalts reason above Divine Revelation until the Word of God may mean anything one may please or nothing if he prefers; and viewing evil

**The True Theology.* By J. T. FREETH, author of "The Inspiration of the Word of God," "Lectures on the Doctrine of the Incarnation," etc. London: H. R. Allenson. 1907. 8vo. cloth or paper. 83 pp.

as a necessary beginning of good, and good as the ripening fruit of evil, it takes away moral responsibility, and sometimes seems to deny any real human freedom.

This tendency is made to appear with great clearness by the Rev. J. T. Freeth, minister of the Deptford and Islington New-Church Societies, London, in this volume, to which he has given the title of "The True Theology." Of it he says:—

The various chapters are an examination, from the New-Church standpoint, of the so-called "New Theology" which the Rev. R. J. Campbell has recently brought into prominence. I venture to call their teaching the *True Theology*, because it appears to me to be rational, scriptural, and true to human experience. And in sending this book out I desire it to be understood that I am entirely indebted to Swedenborg, in whose works the principles of the New Age are fully set forth. (Preface.)

The title at first approach might seem presumptuous to the rationalism and agnosticism so prevalent in the world to-day. But a glance at the brief preface would soften that impression, for there is found a prompt disavowal of sectarianism; and it is followed throughout the chapters with a kindly spirit of candor, and a manly appeal to reason, which wins respect and sympathy, while the examination is searching and the arguments are convincing.

Mr. Campbell lends himself to the purpose of the book admirably, for he too is manly, honest, and fearless, and does not shrink from the extreme results of his positions. And for this reason, if one wishes to understand what the "New Theology" really is, and whither it is leading, his writings present the matter unveiled and unqualified. Mr. Freeth makes the most of this fact, first to show their unreasonableness; and, second, to present in marked contrast with them the reasonable and Scriptural truths of the New Church. For this service, so well done, all lovers of the truths of the Lord's second coming must feel grateful. Indeed, we have seen no book which gives so much information of this important and timely subject so well and in so few pages. But one thing is to be regretted, namely, that the volume is not in a more attractive form. If it had been printed in duodecimo pages, or even smaller, and made thicker, it would be in better proportions, and more likely to be read in these days of artistic book making.

After paying a kindly tribute to Mr. Campbell's honesty, zeal, and personality, our author takes up the first claim of the "New

Theology," namely, that it is an untrammelled return to the Christian sources in the light of modern thought, whose "starting point is a re-emphasis of the Christian belief in the Divine immanence in the universe and in mankind" (p. 10). He shows how this noble truth, always attended by peril, has proved a "slide into pantheism" in the "New Theology"; and further shows how it is possible to avoid this and yet gladly accept the truth that God is intimately involved in all His works, both material and human. He sums it up in such words as the following:—

Now, God is in nature not by becoming it; He is in the spiritual world, not by renouncing Himself and becoming a common Consciousness; but by the influx of His life through the spiritual world into the external forms of the material realm, energizing them, but no more transforming Himself into them than our thought, while governing our bodily movements, is made into bones, flesh, or muscle. The organ pipe is not manufactured out of music. The paper and binding of a book are not constructed from the genius of an author. Even with our puny powers of observation we can see how every day and every moment men are taking the substances of the earth and are moulding them into reflections of their own inner life. But no one ever dreams of saying that the picture or the statue are identical with the personality of the artist who painted the one or carved the other. Why, then, should we be asked to believe that God cannot be in nature unless He is the "cosmic-process," and identified with nature? (p. 17.)

Neither the universe nor humanity is the body of God. They are His work, and He never loses His hold upon them; but they are not Himself. And to every human soul He gives life, and so conditions His gift that our life is our own to do with as we will. . . . Why, we do not even agree as to who God is or as to what He is. So far from being one with Him, we can turn against Him, resist His will, rebel against every law He has ordained for our well-being, and, as Dr. Parker once dramatically said, we can shake the "clenched fist" of sin in His face of mercy and tenderness. And yet out of this very freedom comes the true nobility and greatness of human nature. (p. 18.)

The final conclusion is that God is not essentially an Infinite made up of a number of finites by being identical with them. He is in Himself a glorious personal Being, a Divine Manhood, of which ours is the finite and dependent copy. In this thought we escape pantheism, and can realize that while He is in all as the life and inspiration of all, He is yet transcendent as our Creator, our Saviour, and our Father. (p. 18.)

From our point of view the bearing of this upon the Divinity of our Lord is of first importance. When Mr. Campbell says,—

There is no dividing line between our being and God's except from our side. The ocean of consciousness knows that the bay has never been separate from itself, although the bay is only conscious of the ocean on the outer side of its

own being. . . . My God is my deeper Self, and yours too ("The New Theology," iii. 34, 35),—

it can mean only one thing, among others, in relation to the Lord Jesus. It must mean that every man is a potential Christ—that our relation to the heavenly Father is not different from His; so we can say that interiorly we are one with the Father. Of course, the Virgin Birth must then be ignored or denied; but this can be done easily with the aid of the "Higher Criticism." But Mr. Freeth does not rest his argument upon this ground, so convincing to us, but he meets rationalism with appeals to reason. He says:—

As we have seen that man has no "potentiality" whereby he can become God, so he has no potentiality by which he can become Christ. There is nothing about him or in him whereby the expression "God manifest in the flesh" can be as "true of every individual as ever it was of Jesus." Mr. Campbell says that Jesus was the Only Man. He agrees that we have seen perfect manhood but once, and that Jesus is on the throne and the sceptre is in His hand. . . . The real truth is that Christ is the only Reality. . . . The quality of any life is determined by its essence, and when we say the soul of Jesus was the Deity, we recognize that His Humanity is on a level to which we can never mount. But certainly this does not lessen His power to help to the uttermost those who come unto Him. (pp. 24, 25.)

God was always Human; always a Divine Man. But by the glorification of His Humanity He has provided a way whereby He may be very nigh us, even in the natural degree of life. (p. 28.)

In the chapter on "Right and Wrong Criticism of the Bible," we read:—

What is the position of the "New Theology" in regard to the Bible? The answer is that it does not tell us what the Book is, it gives us no satisfactory and rational view of inspiration, and it leaves unexplained how the Scriptures stand related to the purposes of God and the spiritual needs of men. We are assured that "the New Theology is the religious articulation of the scientific method, the recognition that upon the foundations laid by modern science a vaster and nobler fabric of faith is rising than the world has ever before known. Science is supplying the facts which the new theology is weaving into the texture of religious experience." (p. 30.)

This applied to the Bible is made to mean that "the true seat of authority is within, and not without, the human soul. We are so constituted as to be able to recognize, little by little, the truth of God as it comes to us." Mr. Campbell says, "Never mind what the Bible says about this or that, if you are in search for truth, but trust the voice of God within you." (pp. 30, 31.)

Mr. Freeth examines these views and shows how weak and harmful they are. For example, he points to the fact that instead of one authority it gives millions, since every man becomes a law unto himself. And, he asks, in human relations how would it work? Are we so profoundly convinced that every man is able to recognize the truth, ray by ray, without external guidance, that we are prepared to say to the shop keeper, "Never mind the scales or the yardstick," when we want tea or calico? He then explains the use of the letter as a vehicle of the spiritual meaning, and sums up his argument in such words as these:—

Mr. Campbell with an air of finality says: "God inspires men, not books." But we may well ask, if men are inspired, how can their message be left out of the range of inspiration? The real fact is that it is the Word that *is* inspired. Just as the body acts by virtue of the energizing life and spirit within, so the Divine book commands universal influence, because, as its soul and the secret of its power, there is the constant presence in it of the wisdom of God and a spiritual and unerring sense. It contains the undeviating, unchanging laws of spiritual development. (p. 35.)

From this may be inferred the character of the chapters which complete the book as follows: "Is Evil only a Struggle against Limitation?" "The Doctrine of Reconciliation"; "The Life to Come."

The little volume forms an excellent epitome of "The New Theology" in contrast with the true theology of the New Church. And in saying this we may accept the author's definition of the New Church:—

The New Church is a new dispensation or age of religious life and thought. It is spoken of in the Word of God as the New Jerusalem, or Holy City, descending from Him out of heaven. In it the Lord Jesus is alone worshipped as God; the Word is revered as the Divinely inspired revelation of His will; and His commandments are held to be the laws of life and happiness. In the ordinary sense of the word the New Church is composed of *all* who receive and live these great principles. (Preface.)

THE LIFE OF CHRIST IN RECENT RESEARCH.*

PROFESSOR SANDAY has always been one of the most satisfactory writers on the "Higher Criticism." He is reverent, clear-sighted,

**The Life of Christ in Recent Research.* By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., L.L.D., etc., Lady Margaret Professor, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. New York: American Branch of Oxford University Press. 1907. 8vo. cloth. 328 pp.

learned, and while calling attention to the extreme views and theories and showing their unreasonableness, he always leads firmly to some perception of the Divinity of the Word and of the Lord as the Word made flesh.

I. SYMBOLISM AND CORRESPONDENCE.

This new volume opens with a preliminary chapter on "The Symbolism of the Bible," which is gratifying to us, and with an account of which we will rest our review until our next issue; for, while he does not reach the New-Church doctrine of correspondences as the key of interpretation of its symbolism, he certainly is thinking, in the main, in that direction; and shows how the study of the higher critics may yet prepare the way for a true, spiritual understanding of the Word of God. This may be seen at the outset in his definition of symbolism as follows:—

I must try to define what we mean by symbolism. Symbolism, I think it may be said, is *indirect description*; in other words, it is description or expression by a system of equivalents, in which the terms or media employed do not at once call up the features of the object, but rather suggest them by calling up the features of some other object, like that which it is sought to describe, or which is treated as like it, and for the moment is taken to stand for it. (p. 3, 4.)

He points to the necessity of such a style of writing for purposes of Divine Revelation, inasmuch as that which is to be revealed, the Lord and spiritual things, are of such a nature that *direct* description cannot be employed, for the mind cannot form any picture of them as they really are, but can at most receive suggestion; and he might add that by the use of symbols as defined, or indirect description, the mind can make progress in receiving the suggestions, the revelation may grow more and more comprehensible and be progressive forever with the growth of the mind.

But he does not seem to catch any glimpse of the essential reason for this as known in the New-Church, namely: that it lies in the very nature of creation and revelation, under the law of correspondence, for the spiritual world is the realm of causes and the natural that of effects. He does not observe that creation consists in giving expression to Divine and spiritual things in matter, and that time and space must take the place of changing states of thought and affection; mental progress must enter into mechanical terms which are wholly unlike, but which correspond. So the external object is a sign or

symbol of the thought and affection which produced it, and which it embodies. Words are thus always signs of thoughts. And every creation of man is thus a symbol of what is first in his mind; and every creation of God is a sign and symbol of His Divine thought and affection. How else could the Creator cause a revelation of Himself and His spiritual kingdom to be written than by employing these signs and symbols of Himself and His spiritual creations?

But instead of perceiving this fundamental reason for the symbolism of the Scriptures he attributes it to the meagreness of vocabularies and the simplicity of thought with the ancients. He writes:—

The great enlargement of our vocabulary, the multiplication of abstract ideas, and generally the growth of a scientific habit of mind, impel us to have recourse to direct description, where the ancients would have used indirect. Our processes are analytic, where theirs were poetic and constructive. (p. 4.)

Swedenborg shows that the ancients wrote thus in pure allegory, or correspondences, because it was the only way in which spiritual things and events could be described in earthly language. A single symbol may contain myriads of spiritual ideas, which would fill numberless volumes of earthly writing if it were possible to express them by direct description; aye, the symbols of the Bible thus must contain the infinite wisdom of God or it would not be His revelation of Himself. But for this reason it is of eternal value, and provides for eternal progress.

Dr. Sanday believes in the "Divine employment of human faculties for purposes of Divine Revelation" (p. 8), and so understands the dreams of the patriarchs and the visions of the prophets. He thinks the primitive Hebrew was never really a materialist, though he so appeared; but the appearance he would attribute to imperfection of language and lack of psychological analysis (p. 12). It was because he could speak of God in the lightning and thunder-cloud only as if they were God Himself when he was aware all the time that these things of the earthly senses were symbols only of His Divine presence. (p. 11).

Hence the worship of the Old Testament is accounted for as symbolical of spiritual ideas. The ideas underlying the forms might be more or less unconscious. Thus the covenant of God with Abram, and afterwards with the chosen people at Sinai, contained the idea of God sharing with them His life; the sprinkling of the blood on both sides symbolizing it. This was perpetuated in the

sacrifices, a part being left at the altar for God and a part eaten by the one who offered the sacrifice. (pp. 14 and 15.)

This undoubtedly suggests the spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures which should now be employed; but Dr. Sanday must bring some proof before we can accept his theory that any thing of the kind was in the mind of the Hebrews.

Of the Genesis account of creation he says:—

The cosmogony of the book of Genesis, I cannot help thinking, has had rather hard measure at the hands of criticism. Its sublime features have indeed been pointed out; but along with this there has gone a certain severity of judgment from the point of view of modern science. The application of such a point of view is really a survival from the days when the inspiration of the Bible was identified with verbal infallibility. . . . But I cannot help hoping that the time has come when such corrections will no longer be thought necessary; when, in other words, it will be assumed from the outset that the representations in Genesis i. to iii. are symbolical, and that they were never intended to be literal. (pp. 16, 17.)

In all he writes Dr. Sanday seems to assume that the writers of the books of the Word wrote in the ordinary way from their own intellectual ability. There seems to be no recognition of the operations of Divine Providence in having a receptacle provided for a continuous Divine and spiritual meaning, as the purpose of the symbolism; no perception of the fact that the minds of the writers were inspired to receive the message and deliver it in the Divinely chosen symbols of creation. Hence he says the transition from the symbolical form to the historical was gradual, that facts are mixed with symbolism all through the Pentateuch. For instance, that the narrative of the ten plagues of Egypt is so symmetrical as to show that it is artificial, although having some kind of facts for its basis. The scenes at Sinai he regards in the same way; the literal fact being that God spake to the heart of Moses, and he in the name of the Lord to the people. The fire, smoke, thunder, and quaking Sinai are only poetic, or symbolic, accessories. This he calls the "Historical Symbolism." (p. 20.)

The apocalypse of Daniel and of the Revelation he sees to be almost purely symbolic, and shows that even the expression, "Behold, I come quickly," is not to be understood literally, for it only describes in terms of time that which is not a question of time, but of *certainly* in the nature of things. "God and Christ *must* reign." And he finds a key to the whole prophecy in our Lord's words in replying

to the Seventy when they eagerly tell how even demons yield to them in His name.

Thereupon he says:—

“I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven” (LUKE x. 17, 18). Really the Apocalypse is just an expansion of that. There is, as it were, a heavenly counterpart of the struggle that goes on upon earth. Vast mysterious forces are arrayed against each other in what St. Paul calls “heavenly regions” (*τα ἐπουρανία*). Our Lord laid His finger on the crisis in this battle. Those few successful exorcisms meant immeasurably more than the missionaries who performed them could imagine. They meant that the crisis in that age-long conflict had passed, or was passing, and that the power of Satan was really broken. (p.24.)

We may wish that this thought of the Lord’s conflict with evil spirits could have laid stronger hold upon Dr. Sanday, in order that he might realize that this was the great work of His coming in the flesh even, and that it was especially the work of His second coming which the book of Revelation exclusively describes in pure symbols of the spiritual world.

But he does see something of it, and pre-eminently in the study of our Lord’s temptation in the wilderness, which he seems to regard as apocalyptic, or pure symbolism, describing His struggles with Satan throughout His redemptive work.

And the parables of the Lord, and much of the language of the Lord in reference to His kingdom and to Satan, he cites to show the immense range of symbolism in the Bible, and the extent to which it must be reckoned with at every turn; and especially in considering its meaning concerning Christ and His kingdom. He says:—

We are familiar with the fact that symbolism is used very freely in the Bible; but I am not sure that we realize either the extent to which it permeates the whole volume from end to end, or how important a factor it is, especially in all those problems which have to do with the harmonizing of ancient and modern, of old and new. It is just because these problems are very much upon us at the present time, and because it is more and more impressed upon me that the use of symbolism has a great deal to do with them, that I have been led to choose this subject for my lecture. (p. 3.)

In the next number of the REVIEW we shall consider the bearing of this upon the problems of the “Higher Criticism” as set forth in this valuable book.

STANDARD NEW-CHURCH BOOKS.

The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg. With Portrait. Benjamin Worcester	\$2.00
Swedenborg and the New Church. James Reed	50 cents
Lectures on the New Dispensation. Benjamin F. Barrett	60 cents
The Divine Word Opened. Jonathan Bayley	1.00
Emanuel Swedenborg; his Life, Teachings, and Influence. George Trobridge. Paper	25 cents
Discrete Degrees in Successive and Simultaneous Order. Nathan C. Burnham. Illustrated by Diagrams.	4.00
Dictionary of Correspondences	1.25
General Index to Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations. Arthur Hodson Searle	3.00
The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being. Chauncey Giles	50 cents
Foundation Truths of the Christian Religion; passages selected from Swedenborg	50 cents
The Science of Correspondences Elucidated. Edward Made- ley	1.50
Swedenborg's Doctrine of Correspondence. Lewis P. Mercer	75 cents
An Appeal in Behalf of the Views Held by the New Church. Samuel Noble	75 cents
Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. Theophilus Parsons	50 cents
The Professor's Letters; with Portrait of the Author. Theoph- ilus Parsons	60 cents
Paper boards	30 cents
The Holy Word in its own Defence. Abiel Silver	75 cents
The Swedenborg Concordance. 6 vols. Cloth	24.00
Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Church. Ru- dolph L. Tafel	1.75
Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg; orig- inal and translated. Rev. James Hyde	10.00
Compendium of the Theological Writings of Swedenborg. Samuel M. Warren	1.50
Correspondences of the Bible: Animals. John Worcester	1.00
" " " Plants, etc. " "	1.00
Physiological Correspondences. John Worcester	1.00
Spiritual Interpretation of the Scriptures. John Worcester Genesis and Exodus.	75 cents
Matthew's Gospel.	50 cents

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

No. 16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON

May 10
Aug 24
July 5, 19, 26
Works of Emanuel Swedenborg.

ROTCH EDITION. 12mo.

The Heavenly Arcana disclosed which are in the Sacred Scripture or Word of the Lord. Vols. I. to XIX., text; Vol. XX., index. Each	\$1.25
Heaven and Its Wonders, and Hell	\$1.25
The White Horse. Paper	15 cents
The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine as learned from Heaven	75 cents
The Earths in our Solar System, which are called Planets, and the Earths in the Starry Heavens; their Inhabitants, and Spirits and Angels thence. Paper	30 cents
The Final Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon; also Continuation concerning the Final Judgment and concerning the Spiritual World. Paper	35 cents
The Intercourse between the Soul and the Body. Paper	15 cents
Four Doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Concerning the Lord; the Sacred Scripture; a Life According to the Precepts of the Decalogue; and Faith	\$1.00
Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom: also the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body	\$1.00
Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Providence	\$1.25
The Apocalypse Revealed. 2 Vols.	\$2.50
Marriage Love	\$1.25
A Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church. Paper	25 cents
The True Christian Religion. 3 Vols.	\$3.75
Miscellaneous Theological Works [consisting of The Final Judgment, The White Horse, The Earths in Our Solar System, and the Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church]	\$1.25

The Rotch Edition is now complete as regards the theological writings published by Swedenborg himself.

Our Catalog, listing other editions of Swedenborg's writings as well as works by collateral writers, will be sent on application.

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON